THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1931. Vol. XXI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Birmingham Triangular Duel.

The following correspondence represents, we assume, the concluding stage in the prolonged ecclesiastical struggle known as the St. Aidan's, Small Heath, case, in which the Bishop of Birmingham has striven, in the interests of liturgical order, to prevent the institution of the Rev. G. D. Simmonds to the benefice of St. Aidan's, because he would give no undertaking to observe the Bishop's ruling in the matter of Reservation.

On May 13, the Primate's legal secretary wrote as follows to the Bishop of Birmingham :

'My Lord Bishop,—I am directed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to let your Lordship know that, arising out of the recent judgment of Mr. Justice Maugham, a writ was served on His Grace directing him to admit a fit person to his perpetual curacy at the presentation of the patrons.

'I have further to advise your Lordship that the Archbishop has received a presentation to this benefice of the Rev. George Doyle Simmonds, signed by Mr. Notley, Canon Long, Mr. Agar-Ellis, Mr. Shore, and the Bishop of Truro.

'In these circumstances it becomes the duty of His Grace, now that he has returned to England, to examine the patrons' presentee, which His Grace proposes to do as soon as this can be arranged.

'I am your Lordship's faithful servant,

H. T. A. Dashwood.'

To this the Bishop of Birmingham sent the following reply on May 14 :

'Dear Mr. Dashwood,—I thank you for kindly writing, as legal secretary to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to inform me that His

Grace is proposing to examine the Rev. George Doyle Simmonds to see whether he is a fit person to be admitted to the benefice of St. Aidan's, Small Heath. Perhaps you will kindly remind His Grace of the circumstances which led me, as Bishop, to refuse to admit Mr. Simmonds to the benefice.

'In November, 1925, I published a letter to the clergy of the diocese, in which I asked, *inter alia,* that in public worship, unauthorised services, such as Benediction, Exposition, Devotions, Procession of the Host, etc., should cease. Such services imply erroneous doctrine akin to transubstantiation. They encourage false sacramental teaching, which I, as Bishop, am pledged to banish and drive away.

'When my letter was written, I did not, pending the final form and ultimate fate of the Prayer Book proposals, actually forbid the practice of Reservation, if suitably safeguarded. Nevertheless, my request to the clergy was disobeyed by rather more than a dozen incumbents in Birmingham, who, moreover, banded themselves together to induce their people not to subscribe to diocesan funds. St. Aidan's was one of these so-called 'rebel' churches.

'In November, 1929, Mr. Simmonds was presented to me by the patronage trustees of St. Aidan's. I then said that I would institute him provided he would assure me that in public worship he would obey the regulations of the Prayer Book, and that he would not depart from the law as therein set forth, unless I informed him in writing that I would raise no objection to such action as he might desire to take. I told him that I should not permit Reservation of the consecrated Elements of the Holy Communion, as this practice is illegal.

'Mr. Simmonds refused to give me the assurance which I desired. I presume that His Grace, in examining Mr. Simmonds, will ascertain whether he not only proposes to take, but will also keep, the Oath of Canonical Obedience to me as Bishop of the diocese. If Mr. Simmonds will undertake to obey such lawful directions as I may give with regard to public worship, I will gladly welcome him to the fellowship of the diocese. But I would point out that the regrettable delay and litigation of the last eighteen months have been due to the fact that Mr. Simmonds refused to give any such assurance.

'In addition to asking for the discontinuance of the illegal practice of Reservation, I should ask for the cessation of other irregularities, the existence of two of which I would bring to the notice of His Grace, though I fear they may distress him. In April, 1930, the following appeared in the *St. Aidan's Monthly Magazine* under the heading "The Altar of Repose":—

> "It has been suggested that we should explain what this is. It is the place in Church (in our case the Lady Chapel) where the Blessed Sacrament is taken after Mass on Maundy Thursday, and where It remains until the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday. During this time the altar of repose is made as beautiful as human devotion can make it. Candles are kept burning, and it is surrounded with the choicest flowers, and, what is still more important, the faithful are encouraged to come and spend some time during Maundy Thursday in prayer before Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament. It is obvious that this is a most fitting day for this devotion, etc."

'His Grace will observe in this regrettable paragraph that we have teaching which can only be described as false sacramentalism. It is assumed that the priest has, by formula and ritual act, caused Our Lord Jesus Christ to dwell within the consecrated Elements of Holy Communion. The teaching and language are alike Roman Catholic.

'Recently public attention has been called in the local press to the fact that there is at St. Aidan's an image of the Virgin Mary, in front of which there are framed the following verses :—

"Blessed Mary, when I pray
To Our Lord, Who loves you so,
Will you tell me what to say?
You're His Mother, so you know.

Then, when I have done my best,
Will you pray to Him for me?
And just tell Him all the rest
I could not say properly."

'His Grace will, I trust, agree that the literary style and the theology of these verses are alike deplorable.

'I would finally urge upon His Grace that the errors and puerilities to which I have drawn attention do very great harm to the Church in Birmingham. They cause intelligent people to be contemptuous of us, and are thus a grave hindrance as we try to preach the Gospel of Christ.

'Yours very faithfully,
E. W. BIRMINGHAM.'

The Primate, who made no comment on the Bishop's letter to Mr. Dashwood, wrote to Dr. Barnes on May 30 as follows :

'My dear Bishop,—As you are aware, in consequence of your non-appearance in the action of Notley (and others) *versus* yourself, a writ was issued to me by the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice, dated 11th March, 1931, requiring me, as your Metropolitan, to admit a fit person to the benefice of St. Aidan's, Birmingham. I have felt bound to accept this writ, and to act upon it; and it is now my duty to inform you as to what I have done and purpose to do in accordance therewith.

'The patrons of the benefice have presented to me the Rev. G. D. Simmonds, assistant curate of the parish of St. Mary, Tyne Dock, in the diocese of Durham, requesting me to admit him to the cure. It therefore became my duty to decide whether Mr. Simmonds was a fit person to be admitted.

'I have examined Mr. Simmonds. I was entirely satisfied as to his age, Orders, and moral character; and I received warm testimony from the Bishop of Durham as to his character and services in his present curacy, where he has served since his ordination. As to his spiritual learning and soundness in the Faith, he has satisfied me, in answer to my question, that he sincerely holds the Catholic Faith, as it is held in the Church of England; and, in particular, that, as regards the Holy Communion, he does not hold and will not teach the people

that any adoration "ought to be done unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine," or "unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood."

'I also examined Mr. Simmonds as to ceremonies and practices in the church where he is at present officiating, and specially as to Reservation of the Elements of the Sacrament of Holy Communion. He informed me that, in that church, there has been, and is, no continuous Reservation, and consequently no services have been, or are, held in connexion with the Reserved Sacrament.

'He would, of course, be liable, subject to the Bishop's veto, to suits promoted in the Spiritual Courts for any ceremonies or practices as to which, on the ground of their alleged illegality, he might hereafter be accused. But it would not be in accordance with precedent, and would be manifestly unjust, that he should be questioned as to ceremonies or practices which he has not used or adopted.

'No doubt a clergyman can be refused admission to a cure if, in the past, he has so acted that, were he admitted to the cure, he could be prosecuted in respect of his past acts. But the principle involved in such cases is quite different from that in which I have to act. I am simply asked to certify whether, now, Mr. Simmonds is a fit person to be admitted. In these circumstances, I am obliged to find that Mr. Simmonds is a fit person for the cure to which he has been presented, and, subject to the month's notice required by the Benefices Act, 1898, Section 2 (1), I propose to admit him thereto accordingly.

'I shall then certify to the High Court of Justice as to the manner in which I have executed the writ issued to me.

'You will, I am sure, believe me when I say that it is very distressing and indeed painful, to me to be thus obliged to intervene in the administration of your diocese. But I must not allow personal feelings to affect what seems to me to be my duty.

'Yours very sincerely,

COSMO CANTUAR.'

In reply, the Bishop despatched the following letter to the Primate on June 2:

'My Lord Archbishop,—I beg to thank Your Grace for your letter of May 30th, in which you inform me that you intend to admit the Rev. G. D. Simmonds to the benefice of St. Aidan's, Small Heath. I am pleased to hear that you have examined him, and that, so far as your examination has gone, he has satisfied you as to the soundness of his sacramental doctrine. But Your Grace is aware that the ultimate question between myself and the patronage trustees of St. Aidan's is as to whether the illegal practice of Reservation shall continue at the church.

'I therefore beg to enquire whether Your Grace ascertained that Mr. Simmonds accepts the fact that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped"; and whether, in accordance with this fact, he will obey the rubric of our Prayer Book, which says that if any consecrated bread or wine shall remain after the Communion Office the priest, with such others as he may call to him, shall, "immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."

'I notice that Your Grace says that it would not be in accordance with precedent and would be "manifestly unjust" that Mr. Simmonds should be questioned as to ceremonies and practices which he has not used or adopted. I submit that the existing situation is unparalleled, and that your Grace is, in fact, making a precedent; and I would enquire why it is "manifestly unjust" to ask a man presented to a church where grave irregularities take place, contrary to the law of the land and the Bishop's express directions, whether he will cause such irregularities to cease.

'Let me suggest a possible parallel. Suppose—as is not incredible in this age of confusion—that a clergyman, with the good will of his patronage trustees, should cease to recite the Creeds in public worship. On his retirement, the Bishop would naturally be anxious to know whether the man presented as his successor would continue the same practice. I gather that your Grace is of opinion that you could rightly ask such a man as to his doctrinal beliefs, but that it would be "manifestly unjust," if he had recited the Creeds in public worship in the past, to enquire whether he intended in his new benefice to restore the lawful order of public worship.

'Your Grace reminds me that after Mr. Simmonds has been presented, he will be liable to suits promoted in the Spiritual Courts on the ground that he continues illegal ceremonies or practices. This suggestion of further litigation troubles me greatly. The recent litigation with regard to St. Aidan's has been a scandal which has done grave harm to the Church; and I have not been party to it. That your Grace should contemplate that further litigation may result from your Grace's present action implies that our Church is in a state of disorder, from which disruption is likely to result.

'As your Grace knows, I personally will not try to restrain ecclesiastical disorder by process of law. Mr. Simmonds, when instituted by your Grace, will have to make the Declaration of Assent and to take the Oath of Canonical Obedience to me, as Bishop of Birmingham. Should he repudiate the solemn pledges which he thus gives, such repudiation would be a moral and spiritual lapse which I could not bring myself to lay before either a Civil or a Spiritual Court.

'Such communications as have reached me, directly or indirectly, from the trustees during the past eighteen months, I have been asked to regard as confidential. A request of such a nature on a matter of public importance cannot rightly be made. But, inasmuch as in this matter I am most anxious to avoid all personal issues, I will merely repeat that the issue of Reservation has, throughout, been fundamental.

'Had I been willing, in February, 1930, to allow Mr. Simmonds to practice Reservation at St. Aidan's under the conditions laid down in the abortive Prayer Book of 1928, I should have been exposed to no further litigation. But the suggestion that Reservation should be made legal caused Parliament to reject the Prayer Book proposals of 1927 and 1928.

'I have heard it urged that the Church sanctioned Reservation by allowing those proposals to go forward; but your Grace will agree that definite sanction can only be given by means of a new Canon, and that no such Canon has been passed. Moreover, even by the proposals of 1928, the Bishop, before issuing a licence for Reservation, was to be satisfied that need for it existed.

'It is true that an appeal against his decision would have been possible to the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province. But the proposals were rejected. Subsequently, by a majority, the Bishops in the Upper House of Convocation resolved:

> That the Bishops, in the exercise of that legal or administrative discretion which belongs to each in his own diocese, will be guided by the proposals set forth in the Book of 1928.

'But—I quote your Grace's own words—" that discretion remains with the Bishop in each diocese. It is for him to decide in any particular case how far he may think it right to follow the guidance of these proposals."

'The St. Aidan's patronage trustees have, in effect, claimed to decide that Reservation shall be continued at St. Aidan's Church contrary to the will of Parliament. I must, with respect, point out that, unless by a more complete examination, your Grace assures yourself that Mr. Simmonds will not adopt Reservation at St. Aidan's, your present action will make it possible for the decision of Parliament to be over-ruled in any instance where the Bishop is not willing to bring a legal action against a clergyman whom your Grace may admit.

'Believe me to be,

Your Grace's obedient servant,

E. W. BIRMINGHAM.'

To Modernists the St. Aidan's, Small Heath, case has been deeply distressing at every stage of its process. In their conduct of it the three principal parties seem to us to have laid themselves open to serious criticism. We hasten to explain that we do not regard Mr. Simmonds as one of the principals. He is merely a pawn, and a blameless pawn, on the ecclesiastical chess-board.

We should much prefer to pass over this case in complete silence, and we do not forget that there is a silence which is golden. On the other hand, there is a silence which is base and cowardly, and our silence in such a case as this might be rightly construed in that way. We would not be of those of whom the judicious Hooker wrote, who 'loosely through silence permitted things to pass away as in a dream.' There are important principles at stake in the conduct of this case, principles which it is our duty to affirm and defend.

As Modernists we appreciate highly the conscientious desire of the Primate not to infringe the rights of the patrons of the benefice. Scrupulous self-restraint by prelates in this matter seems to us worthy of high commendation. Equally admirable is the Primate's sensitiveness to the rights of a young clergy-

man whose conduct has been unexceptionable, even though the company he keeps may be suspect. On the other hand, the Primate seems to us to have fallen short in his duty to the Bishop of Birmingham, whose Metropolitan he is. By not obtaining from Mr. Simmonds, as a condition of his institution, a promise that he would undertake to obey the Bishop's ruling in the matter of Reservation, the Primate has weakened the authority of the Bishop in the very difficult task of administering his diocese, and has set at nought the episcopal understanding that, in the matter of Reservation, the ruling of the Diocesan Bishop within the limits prescribed by the Authorized Prayer-Book and the Deposited Book, should prevail in his own diocese. By raising the issue of 'continuous Reservation' with Mr. Simmonds, his Grace would seem to give the impression that Reservation is legal, although not sanctioned by the local bishop, and that Dr. Barnes has no right to forbid Reservation in accordance with the rubrics of the Authorized Prayer-Book. The Primate's action seems to us a deadly blow to the Bishop of Birmingham's authority within his diocese and to the authority of the Authorized Prayer-Book. Moreover, the Primate's action is bound to outrage the feelings of Evangelical Churchmen, who are still the largest body in the National Church. For these reasons, while we recognize the great difficulties of the Primate's position, we deplore his action in this matter.

On the other hand, the way in which the Bishop of Birmingham has conducted his case is open to serious objection. When the Bishop declared himself as resolved to take no clergyman into court for flagrant breaches of the liturgical rules, we respected his Christian idealism and pacific temper, although we felt that there might be cases in which an intimation to institute legal proceedings would most effectively check extreme liturgical lawlessness in cases where it was creating a local or diocesan scandal. When however Dr. Barnes refused—let us confess it, with very great courage—to defend himself against the charges of his opponents in the High Court, and so placed himself in contempt of court, we were unable to support his action. There does seem to be something curiously inconsistent in a bishop appealing for obedience on the ground of a decision of Parliament, which is the nation's

supreme court of judicature, and yet declining to recognize the authority of the High Court. The Bishop seemed thereby to place himself above the law and to favour the pretensions of an absolutist prelacy. The only sure protection of our liberties as Churchmen and citizens rests on reverence for legal rights. If law be ignored, injustice and even anarchy must ensue. Of course Dr. Barnes did not ignore it except, as he believed, for the best of reasons. He wished to contend only with moral and spiritual weapons against those who had claimed to use only the same. He was ready, like the old-time champions of the Oxford Movement, to go to prison for his cause. It was noble and heroic on his part, but we are compelled to assert that his policy was mistaken. We have intense admiration for the Bishop. We are in entire sympathy with his courageous and clear-headed resolution to deliver the Church of England from the paralysis of obscurantism and superstition which prostrates her at the present time, but by refusing to plead in the High Court, the Bishop has placed his supporters in an ambiguous position.

What are we to say of the action of the Bishop of Truro and his fellows? When they appealed to the High Court, at least it may be claimed that they acted lawfully and acknowledged in the most public and practical fashion the Royal Supremacy and the rightfulness of appealing to the civil courts in ecclesiastical disputes. Nevertheless their appeal came as a moral shock to many: it smacked of opportunism and the unprincipled resolve to win by any means in their power. It seemed to many to be the bare-faced denial of their party principles and professions, and to justify the sardonic comment that the Anglo-Catholics had only ceased to appeal to the law when they perceived that they stood the chance to gain more by other methods. Their conduct presents an amazing contrast to the noble, if mistaken, spiritual idealism of Dr. Barnes.

The whole case, as we have said, has been deeply distressing to Modernists, and to comment on it is for us equally painful. We hope that Mr. Simmonds will come into the Birmingham diocese as an angel of peace, and that he will endeavour to win 'the rebels' there, who hail his appointment as a triumph for their cause, to abandon their policy of opposition and disintegration.

THE UNIVERSITIES AND CONVOCATION.

On June 2, the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury rejected the proposal that the Universities should send Proctors to the Lower House. The Dean of Westminster took a leading part in securing the rejection of this proposal. Dr. Harris, who has done good work in the promotion of clerical scholarship, could not agree with the Dean of Westminster that the Universities are becoming increasingly lay bodies. He regarded the work of teaching as a pastoral charge and lamented that some bishops objected to ordaining a man who was only engaged in teaching.

After the Prolocutor had announced to the Upper House of Convocation that the Lower House had rejected the proposal by 50 votes to 36, the Bishop of Chichester remarked that it was a calamity that the Lower House had rejected a resolution of importance with so little consideration, and he hoped that it would be presented again at a subsequent session. The present time was peculiarly opportune for closer relations between the Church and the Universities. The assistance of the Universities would be valued when Convocation had to face difficult doctrinal problems.

The Bishop of Ely said that an opportunity of making a gracious gesture to the Universities had been lost, and that the action of the Lower House would harden the prejudice already existing in the Universities against Church officialdom.

The Bishop of Birmingham took the same line, emphasizing the gain which would accrue to the Church by closer contact with the Universities, especially on their scientific side.

At the conclusion of the discussion, the following resolution was passed by 19 votes to 1 :

> The Upper House welcomes the representation of the Universities in Convocation on the lines proposed in the Report of the Joint Committee, and earnestly hopes that the Lower House will give fresh consideration to the resolutions appended to the Report on an early occasion.

If the Church loses weight in the Universities, it is doomed in the country. The Universities are so many-sided to-day that they represent educated intelligence of every type. Clerical representatives of the Universities are certainly needed in the

Lower Houses of the Convocations, but the Church Assembly would also be benefited by having a number of lay representatives of the Universities in its House of Laymen.

The Memorandum on Reunion with Non-Protestant Churches.

The following Memorandum signed by Archdeacon Storr, Professor Burkitt, and some forty others, clergy and laity, draws attention to a dangerous tendency in certain recent reunion negotiations :

> The Third Report of the Lambeth Conference, that on the Unity of the Church, raises questions concerning the doctrinal position of Church of England to which we wish to call attention. We are in favour of all movements towards union, communion and closer intercourse among Christian Churches, where broad general agreement renders it possible; and hold that there should be no rigid insistence upon uniformity in doctrine, organization or details of worship. We should therefore not seek to impose our own position upon other Churches; but on the other hand we ought not, in order to win their favour, to abandon our own position or, still less, represent it in a one-sided manner.
>
> Our warmest sympathy goes out to the Orthodox Church in its present trials, and we acknowledge with gratitude the brave and consistent stand of the Old Catholic Churches against modern Roman errors.
>
> As regards the Old Catholics, while there is very much in the Declaration of Utrecht with which we can agree, to accept it as it stands would be a denial of our own position. Its Appeal is primarily to the 'Primitive Church' (by which it seems to mean the Church of the first ten centuries), not, as with us, primarily to Scripture. We do not, for exaple, recognise the decisions of the Second Council of Nicaea (787) which approved the worship of images. And while it has been contended that the statement that 'we receive the Body and the Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ under the species of Bread and Wine' is capable of an interpretation not consistent with the tenets of our Church, it is more suggestive of teaching which our Church has rejected as false. Moreover the exegesis of Heb. ix, 11, 12, propounded in the Declaration of Utrecht has been rejected by our most scholarly theologians.
>
> Again, in the Résumé of the discussions with the Orthodox Church contained in the Report of the Lambeth Conference, we observe some ambiguous or one-sided statements, not representing our true position. On pp. 134-5 of the Report, the relation of the Thirty-nine Articles to the Prayer Book is so stated that the Articles are said to be explained by the Prayer Book, and not *vice versa*. The Articles deal for the most part with principles, the Prayer Book deals with their personal and practical application. The particular application does not interpret or exhaust the general principle, which goes beyond it. It is indeed a sound rule that when one of two authorities appears ambiguous, it must be interpreted by the clearer; herein lies largely the value of the Articles.

On p. 135 the passages quoted from the Catechism and Articles are incomplete. That from the Articles continues: 'And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith,' thus making more clear that reception by the spirit is meant. Furthermore, the careful verbal distinction in the Article between the prior statement that 'The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spirtual manner' and the statement following, 'And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith,' expressly excludes the possibility of the 'Body' being given by the hand of the Minister, or taken by the hand of the Communicant. And what the Catechism really says is that 'the inward part or thing signified [in the Lord's Supper] is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper,' a statement which fixes the meaning if the word 'faithful' as those who have 'a lively faith' in agreement with the definition of the Article. Moreover, no authority is quoted for the statement (p. 135) that 'after Communion the consecrated elements remaining are regarded as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, in that they have the same efficacy as before the administration.' This view should not be allowed to pass as that of our Church; it is confined to a party in it. We know of no 'efficacy' apart from their use, *viz.* reception. Nor are the actual words of the Résumé on p. 139 justified. The Reply of the Archbishops to the Pope's Letter was criticised at the time as a very ambiguous and misleading statement. It has no more authority than many other episcopal declarations of the past century, some of which would be widely rejected now.

In the Résumé the application of the phrase 'that we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins' to 'the whole company of faithful people living and departed' has been widely advanced as a personal opinion, but it is not authoritative. The words occur during the Order of Communion, but, in our own Service Book and in the Irish and Canadian, only during the Post-Communion, after consecration and reception have taken place. There is therefore no justification for linking them with the phrase 'in the offering of the Eucharist Sacrifice.' These latter words are not only ambiguous, but also they do not occur in the Prayer Book, nor is there anything in the Articles or Prayer Book to support their use.

In judging the Anglican doctrine of Holy Communion the principle weight should be given to the Thirty-nine Articles. These were drawn up in 1552-3 with the Book of 1552 before their authors; but they underwent a most thorough revision in 1563 (completed in 1571) when the Elizabethan Book (which varied little from 1552), here substantially identical with our present Book, was in force. They thus present the official interpretation put upon the Prayer Book by its compilers or revisers. His Majesty's Declaration, now prefixed to the Articles, shows how they were regarded by Charles I and by Laud as presenting the standard doctrine of the Church.

In regard to subscription to the Articles we recognise that various interpretations of its force are current. But while considerable latitude of individual interpretation exists, the Articles in their plain and obvious sense remain the standard. An 'interpretation' of any phrase in the Prayer Book, obviously not in accordance with this standard,

cannot have any authority. In existing circumstances, if the Articles be set aside, the danger of one-sided presentation of the doctrine of the Church of England would be largely increased.

Dr. Headlam, as Chairman of the Lambeth Conference Committee for the Unity of the Church, immediately issued a reply to this document. In his reply he asserted that the Lambeth Conference did not accept the Declaration of Utrecht as expressing the Anglican point of view, nor suggest that we should in any way adopt it. So far so good; but the Bishop goes on to say that there is nothing in it inconsistent with the teaching of the Church of England. If Dr. Headlam means by the teaching of the Church of England the doctrine of that Church as contained in the Book of Common Prayer, the Ordinal, and the Thirty-nine Articles, which are formularies subscribed by every clergyman of the Church of England, his statement breaks down under investigation.

The Declaration of Utrecht must be interpreted historically in the light of Old Catholic formularies of worship and instruction. There is no doubt that the Old Catholics practise and teach much which the Church of England definitely and deliberately abandoned at the Reformation, *e.g.* that there are Seven Sacraments instituted by Christ; that it is permissible to use images in public worship; to pray to the Virgin and the Saints; to offer propitiatory masses for the dead; to receive the Eucharist in one kind. It is not unfair to say that their main intention in ordaining a priest is to empower him to offer propitiatory sacrifices. We could cite a number of other things in which their beliefs differ from ours, but those given will suffice to justify the protest made in the Memorandum. Of course it may be, and probably is the case, that many Old Catholics to-day are a good deal more enlightened than their formularies, as is the case also with ourselves. If they supposed that we are strictly tied in our belief and teaching to our formularies they would gravely misjudge us. There is much of the ancient uncouth good in these documents that the evolution of modern thought has compelled us to abandon, and we may hope that the same process is going on among them. It is in the orthodoxy of the future, rather than in the orthodoxy of the past, that we shall find doctrinal agreement. In any case we have no desire to play

the part of inquisitors in the investigation of their beliefs and practices, nor are we disposed to allow them to think that we are in agreement with them when obviously in many things we are not. We desire intercommunion with them, and with the Greek Orthodox Churches, on the ground that we are fellow Christians and ought not to exclude each other. For the same reason we desire intercommunion with Rome and the great Protestant Churches. The notion that theological agreement is needful for intercommunion must be relegated to the past. The communicants of every Christian Church should be welcome, simply on the ground that they are communicants and desire to unite in this supreme act of Christian worship. This will seem a hard saying to some, but it constitutes the Modernist's objective in this matter. We shall not find that we love our own services the less, nor our own Church the less, if this freedom be granted and used. It may even lead to a better understanding and appreciation of what we possess in the Church of England.

With regard to the Thirty-nine Articles, we have no mind to see them privily jettisoned. They unite us to the great principles of the Reformation, and we are not disposed to abandon them, although there are many Churchmen that are. The Articles, like the Creeds, contain serious difficulties and some incredibilities, but we cannot acquiesce in the abandonment of the Articles without the abandonment of the Creeds. If it be time that we had new Articles, it is also time that we had new Creeds. We recognize the great difficulty of securing both at present. We believe much more education is needful before this desirable transition can be accomplished. Meanwhile the great difficulties of modern-minded ordinands and clergymen in the Church of England can be considerably reduced by realizing that our subscription binds us only to a general assent. It suffices, provided that we can hold to the main positions of Catholic and Reformed Christianity as the postulates of our Christian Faith. Meanwhile we need, in our efforts to secure reunion, to take care that we do nothing to check theological evolution or thwart the guidance of the Spirit Who would lead us into all truth.

DO WE OWE ANYTHING TO THE OXFORD MOVEMENT?

By Rev. E. J. Martin, D.D., Chaplain of Ripon Training College.

I.

IT is hardly necessary to repeat the facts about the Oxford Movement. Starting from the Assize Sermon preached by John Keble in St. Mary's, Oxford, on 14th July, 1833, it was the Church's reply to the spread of Liberalism in Church and State. 'The movement was positive also. It aimed at making religious life more real. Its authors were . . . resolute to force themselves into the mould of the most perfect past that they could conceive.'[1] The leaders of the movement — Newman, Keble, Hurrell Froude, and later Pusey — broadcasted their appeal to a traditional religion by means of the *Tracts for the Times*. Newman and others were led by their own principles into the Church of Rome, while others endeavoured to bring Rome into the Church of England. After 1845, when Newman seceded, the movement is no longer entitled to the epithet of Oxford.

Much has been written on the subject, and before its centenary in 1933 still more will be written. For the actual Oxford Movement (1833-1845) no one shows us the facts and the actors with more charm and insight than Dean Church, while for later developments Canon Ollard is at least the official guide. It is worth trying once more to estimate the permanent results, to disentangle the purely accidental sequences which owe their occurrence to the march of time or the spirit of the age from those effects which in all human probability would not have come into being if the *Tracts for the Times* had not been written. Of these, some are insignificant, others have been temporary, and some have been undesirable. These weaknesses hardly need a cataloguer. Our generation has seen too often at first hand the weakness and degeneracy of the movement. We are too familiar with parish clergy and their parishioners quarrelling about ornaments. We have seen correspondents in church

[1] Watson, *The Church of England*, p. 220.

papers appealing for unity on a platform to consist of removing the *Gloria* to the beginning of the Communion Office and combining the Prayer for the Church with the Prayer of Consecration. We have heard the Vicar and his wife called Father and Mrs. Smith. We have learnt to think of holidays as pilgrimages. But these things will never show us what the Oxford Movement has meant; much less are they indications of its values.

II.

Canon Ollard has attempted to summarize the contributions of permanent value which the English Church owes to the movement as (*a*) The revival of religious or monastic life, (*b*) Zeal for Foreign Missions, (*c*) A new conception of the Episcopal Office, (*d*) The application of the corporate ideal to social life, (*e*) A new type of Christian character, especially among the clergy.[2] Of these features, (*b*) and (*d*) are not really correct inferences, and (*a*) and (*c*) are of doubtful advantage.

(*a*) The revival of religious or monastic life. It is difficult to agree that this is a gain to religion. Discussion of the basis of monasticism can hardly be attempted here. But it would be easy to argue that a brotherhood or sisterhood can pay no service to God that its individual members could not pay in the fellowship of the rest of God's people. Most of the Anglican societies for men can only by a long stretch of language be called monasteries at all. Their value to the Church is the value of any college of clergy or Christian workers. The value of sisterhoods is primarily to the members themselves.

(*b*) Zeal for Foreign Missions is neither a result nor a prerogative of the Oxford Movement. It is not even necessary to discuss that.

(*c*) A new conception of the Episcopal Office. This is attributed to Wilberforce of Oxford, and is based ultimately on the Oxford Movement. We have exchanged the Greek Play bishop for the card-index bishop. It is questionable whether a right reverend organizer is thereby any more the Father in God and guide of the Church than a right reverend commentator. Anyone who will turn over the Form of Consecrating an Archbishop

[2] In Hastings' *Enc. of Religion and Ethics, IX*, p. 588.

or Bishop in the Book of Common Prayer will see that the Wilberforce ideal is not outlined there. The first words addressed to the newly-consecrated bishop are, 'Give heed unto reading.' Can a bishop of the new type have time to read at all, much less to give heed to what he reads?

(*d*) Application of the corporate ideal to social life. This is illustrated by such movements as the Christian Social Union. But as with Foreign Missions, this is an example of the Oxford stream running into other streams of Christian activity. It would have been equally true of some of the early Evangelicals like the Clapham Sect, who, Fitzjames Stephen said, were responsible for most of the philanthropic Christianity of the early nineteenth century. In actual fact, the original Tractarians were without social realism. Newman's *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, preached between 1836 and 1840, never refer even obliquely to the real subjects of the day, Chartism, the Irish Famine, the Abolition of Slavery on British soil. Social zeal had no roots in the principles of the movement. It broke in through the *Lux Mundi* school with a doctrine of the Incarnation whose source was not Pusey but Maurice.

(*e*) A new type of Christian character. This is probably true and to it we shall revert.

There are other results of the movement which have been temporarily of value and then have passed into a stage when their merits have grown less and less. The aesthetic aspect of the movement is an example. The desire for clean churches, dignified fittings, and simple beauty, which came into the movement from Cambridge, owes something to the purely secular advance in standards of comfort among the middle classes. In the end it stereotyped an ugliness, different from the original, but hardly more attractive. Sham Gothic buildings, commercial church furniture, cheap brass ware, ill-advised 'restoration' of ancient churches, all these have been the unhappy result, to say nothing of statuettes in coloured pottery, Stations of the Cross little above the style of grocers' almanacs, and colour schemes which tolerated ecclesiastical magentas and purples. It was not this kind of thing that Clutton-Brock meant when he appealed for a recognition of the Beauty of God. The aesthetic side of the Oxford Movement hardly rose above an imitation of the

past, sometimes a well-informed imitation, but rarely reaching the level of creative beauty, and often falling a ready victim to the shoddy and the commonplace. The same could be said of the music of the movement. The decisive return in the newer hymn-books to eighteenth century melodies is significant. The verse writers who found inspiration in the movement — Keble, Mason Neale, J. H. Newman, Faber, and Christina Rossetti — have deeper roots. Their allegiance to the movement is not essential to their poetic powers.

III.

But three features of the movement have a large and permanent meaning for every kind of Churchman. They are all essential to the movement and not mere accidents. They are (1) Learning; (2) The discovery of an antidote to a religion of pure emotion; (3) The display, especially among the clergy, of a type of Christian character of which the key-word is Gravity (*Gravitas*, σεμνότης),

The Bishop of Gloucester says that the weakness of the Oxford Movement lay in its failure to make any popular appeal, contrasting it with Wesleyanism.[3] This is true so far as it goes. But a more exact truth is that it is the religion of the Book of Common Prayer that has not been designed to grip the mass of uneducated people. The compilers of the Prayer-Book aimed high, some might say too high. The religion of Jesus is not the privilege of any class or position. Parochial experience must have made many an English clergyman wonder whether with simpler tools he might not have helped his people more. The Exhortation attributed to Peter Martyr in the Communion Office of 1552 is a masterpiece of English composition, but by universal consent it has fallen into complete disuse. Is that parabolic?

The Oxford men for good or ill accepted the renaissance character of Anglicanism and set themselves to carry out the system of a learned church. As scholars they may (except Newman) be dull to our tastes, but they were in the best English theological and historical (*i.e.* antiquarian) tradition, the tradition of Hooker and Butler and Cosin, of Dugdale, Bingham,

[3] Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival.* Preface, p. x.

Gibson, Tanner, and Wilkins.[4] They worked hard and carefully at their books. The *Library of the Fathers* stands high to their credit. They may have been over-impressed by the past. Their minds were tidy rather than profound. When Pusey collected evidence, he collected all that was available. They were all insular and prejudiced, but they were very English. Curiosity has wondered what would have happened if Newman had known German. But what did happen to Pusey who did know it? The scholarship of the group had definite limitations. It was antiquarian rather than constructive, historical rather than philosophical. But it was scholarship. And 'the very earliest objection urged home against the new doctors was that in their system the road to truth seemed to be laid through learning, and by consequence the plain and unlettered man was excluded from salvation.'[5]

This plausible criticism unfortunately carried weight. Mark Pattison in the essay already quoted, *Learning in the Church of England*, with his usual acuteness has analysed the process by which the successors of the Tractarians abandoned their ideal. With the praiseworthy object of reaching his parishioners, the divine and scholar became the 'active clergyman.' 'He is not "idle" as he can truly boast; for indeed he has not spent an hour a day in solitary and studious retirement since he was ordained.'[6] What Mark Pattison said in 1863 is being said by our bishops in 1931. Activity has proved barren. The Archbishop of Canterbury has compared it to the roundabout at the fair: after the bustle and noise and expense of energy we get off where we got on. The Tractarians stood for learning. They were right. Where they missed their way was in confining religious learning to antiquarian learning. Their successors neglected the warning of Erasmus, and by identifying the new knowledge with heterodoxy made orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance. There have been honourable exceptions right down to the present day, but honourable exceptions are not enough.

[4] 'At the first rise of the Tractarian school above the horizon in 1833 . . . it was instinctively felt to be a revival of learned research . . . The new leaders were recognised by all the orthodox party as descendants in the direct line from our great divines.' Mark Pattison, *Essays*, II, p. 269.

[5] Pattison, *loc. cit.*, p. 270. The whole essay will repay study.

[6] *Ib.*, p. 275.

(2) The Tractarians did permanent good in discovering an antidote to the emotionalism which in their day had been identified with real religion. The Evangelical Revival which had put new zeal into English religion made feeling the test of religious experience, and even created experience by means of the emotions. These emotional demands could not be met by the average clergyman. He found that he could not achieve the fervour of conversion. He settled down into the conventional country gentleman, whose only interest in religion consisted in reading the services on Sunday. Newman and his friends guessed that there must be a different method of religion, inspired by a more trustworthy power than feeling, a consciousness of God which might be deepened by training, but which came to man from without, and remained constant in spite of passing moods and lack of emotional fervour. Such an external religion may easily become formal, as the greatest of external religions, legalistic Judaism, shows, but it has the supreme advantage of being independent of transient feeling.

The Church and the Sacraments became the principal, but not the only, features of this kind of Anglicanism. Bishop Gore has stated its character very fairly:

> 'Emotion is an extraordinarily powerful force in religion, and the uneducated are even more emotionally susceptible than the educated. But emotion is also variable and delusive. We are enthusiastic and cold, elated and depressed by turns, and we know not why. In two ways the religion of Christ would direct our attention away from our emotions. Partly by making our acts, that is our will, the test of genuineness and not our feelings. Partly, also, by the institution of sacraments. By sacraments spiritual gifts . . . are imparted to us objectively as outward acts and signs . . . the injunction given to us is addresses to our wills, not to our emotions . . .'[7]

What Bishop Gore describes as 'making our acts, that is our will, the test' is the high ethical idealism which marked the Oxford Movement.

> 'The note struck in the first of Mr. Newman's published sermons, *Holiness necessary for future blessedness,* was never allowed to be out of mind. The movement was above all a moral one.'[8]

In the course of its progress this ethical idealism waned as sacramental idealism grew. Some would claim that this was effect and cause. Certainly the successors to the Oxford men developed an enthusiasm for sacramentalism much more readily

[7] *The Holy Spirit and the Church,* p. 147.
[8] Church, *The Oxford Movement,* 3rd ed., p. 190.

than for purely ethical interests. One result was that the sentimentalism their teachers had tried to escape came back with the Prisoner of the Tabernacle and the Mater Dolorosa.

(3) A quality of gravity of character. This is the moral power described by the Greek σεμνότης and the Latin *gravitas*. English has no exact equivalent. It is worth dwelling on this virtue, for it is the feature of the Tractarians which is of unqualified worth, and still remains too little prized. In the New Testament the word (or its adjective) is confined to the Pastoral Epistles, with the single exception of its use in Philippians iv, 8, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ ὅσα σεμνά, where in the English R.V. the inadequate translation 'honourable' is kept. It means 'possessed of a sense of the seriousness of life.' 'Gravity,' says Hazlitt, 'is one great ingredient in the conduct of life. . . . Few people can afford to be quite unaffected. At any rate, do not put your worst qualities foremost. Do not seek to distinguish yourself by being ridiculous, nor entertain that miserable ambition to be the sport and butt of the company.'[9] To the clergy, upon whom in particular the Oxford Movement impressed this quality, gravity is a warning against buffoonery and secularity. The former is the danger of the younger clergy, the latter of the older.

> 'Seriousness,' says Dean Church of the Tractarians, 'reverence, the fear of insincere words and unsound professions were essential in the character which alone it would tolerate in those who made common cause with it. . . . Deeply fixed in the mind of the teachers, this serious governance of life, this direction and purification of its aims laid strong hold on the consciences of those who accepted their teaching. This training was not showy . . . but it was true and enduring and it issued often in a steady and unconscious elevation of the religious character. . . . Even among those who ultimately parted from the movement, with judgment more or less unfavourable to its theology and general line, it left, as if uneffaceable, this moral stamp, this value for sincerity and simplicity of feeling and life, the keen sense of the awfulness of things unseen.'[10]

Pusey enters in his diary the resolution 'to pray daily for σεμνότης.'[11] Pusey perhaps exaggerated the virtue of this temper into something gloomy and joyless. But Canon Ollard's summary is just:

> 'The first Tractarians were marked by reserve, resolute self-discipline, unworldliness, shrinking from preferment, hatred of sham and pretence, and a grave distrust of feeling.'[12]

[9] *Literary Remains*. London, 1836.
[10] *Op cit.*, pp. 191, 192.
[11] *Life*, III, p. 105.
[12] *Op. cit.*, p. 589.

What Dean Church called 'the keen sense of the awfulness of things unseen' came afterwards to show itself not so much in the personal character of the men as in the spread of a new attitude to the supernatural. After the Renaissance, Christians saw the Divine much less as an abnormal intrusion into the universe. The eighteenth century had in England so greatly discredited that idea of the supernatural that it ceased to play a great part in active religion. The note of awe is markedly absent from Wesley and the Evangelical Revival.

> Jesu, lover of my soul,
> Let me to thy bosom fly.

would have been an impossible plea in the religion of the Tractarians, not because it was emotional, but because it was too familiar.

Yet here there were extravagant sequels. The Tractarian sense of awe developed into something like Otto's 'numinous.' It revived half-forgotten beliefs in angels and in spirits good and evil, and fixed itself upon the mystery of the Eucharistic Presence. Much of this was degeneration from the austerity and moral power of the Tractarians and from Newman's 'two luminously self-evident facts, God and my own soul.'

A strange passion for mystery continued to grow. Some minds became engrossed with paradox and that which passeth understanding. Dr. Neville Figgis is a significant figure in the last stages of this development, a less frivolous Father Knox, a less hearty Mr. Chesterton, the Huysmans of Anglicanism. His first essays on religion, *The Gospel and Human Needs*, should be read in order to appreciate how desperately certain types of personality fight for the mysterious as a shield against scepticism.

A religion which Manning probably knew hardly better than Newman, the pathological religion which people like Aubrey Beardsley found in Roman Catholicism, in the later stages of the movement developed even in Anglicanism. It appealed to those tormented souls for whom there waited Barbey d'Aurevilly's alternative, the point of the pistol or the foot of the Cross. Many of them used Anglicanism only as a waiting-room for Rome, but they left some marks behind them. The apologetic of Dr. Figgis and Mr. Chesterton is probably quite unsound

and without permanent value. It has perverted the quality of gravity from which it was born. But this perversion need not blind us to the vital religious worth of true gravity. It is because of that moral element of awe that a genuine reverence has permeated the whole English Church, and to that attitude the credit is due, if the clergy are more worthy of the title by which they are officially addressed; for σεμνός of course is Reverend. The movement in this way planted in the clergy a lofty sense of their vocation and raised the standard of their inner life. In consequence, the clergy most influenced by the movement have won a respect denied to their principles. The Tractarians did not succeed in impressing the Church of England either with their regard for learning or with their dislike of sentiment, but they have given to it a deeper gravity than it has ever possessed either before or since the Reformation. Apart from this wholly excellent effect, the benefits of the Oxford Movement are much less definite than they are often claimed to be.

THE MENACE OF THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY*

'And Samuel told all the words of the Lord unto the people that asked of him a king. And he said, this will be the manner of the king that shall reign over you: he will take your sons and appoint them unto him for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and they shall run before his chariots. And he will take your fields and your vineyards and your oliveyards, even the best of them, and give them to his servants. He will take the tenth of your flocks, and ye shall be his servants.' (*I Samuel,* viii, 10, 11, 14 and 17.)

MY text will be recognized as drawn from a passage which belongs to a Deuteronomic editor's account of the establishment of the Hebrew Monarchy. Compared with the narrators of the earlier stories, the Deuteronomist is found wanting in historical accuracy. Their interest is in the life-stories of the individual Hebrew heroes. He is concerned with the whole movement of national history. But whereas the earlier narrators

* Sermon by the Rev. E. C. Ratcliff, M.A., St. John's College, Fellow and Chaplain of Queen's College, Oxford, preached before the University of Cambridge, in Great St. Mary's Church, on Sunday, May 31st, 1931.

recount their stories for the stories' sake, the Deuteronomist is interested in national history, primarily because it can be made to teach a religious lesson congenial to his mind. He is a preacher rather than an historian. His *métier* is not so much to tell a tale as to adorn it with a moral; and he is so accustomed to drawing a moral from the tale that quite naturally he reverses the process and constructs the tale to suit the moral. His sense of the fitting is stronger than his appreciation of the actual. With the Deuteronomist, in fine, it is the moral that matters, and if we are to read with sympathetic understanding what he has written, it is to his moral that we must first address ourselves. In his unhistorical account of the establishment of the monarchy, the moral may be found in the prophecy put into the mouth of Samuel the Seer, some words of which you have heard as my text. The prophecy, it will be remembered, is both a description and a warning. It is a description of the tyrannical character assumed by the monarchy in the course of its development; and it is a warning that such a tyranny is the inevitable term of the development of a monarchy. The Deuteronomist, not being a Greek, does not present his moral in abstract terms. But the general principle is clear. To make a gift of power to an institution of this description, he would tell us, is to invite a misuse of that power. History affords ample evidence that, although the institution may seem to be required by, or to be desirable or even inevitable in view of, a certain set of circumstances, when those circumstances change, the institution must change too. The aim and end of the institution, which originally were the general service and good, will inexorably become its own maintenance, its self-consolidation in an impregnable position, at any cost and by any means. What was established as a safeguard of common liberties and independence continues as an effective instrument for their suppression; and what at its inception was hailed as a sign of health and life is transformed into a centre of disease and decay.

The Deuteronomist's moral is undeniably sound. He wrote, of course, out of his historical knowledge, out of his reflection upon the course taken by the monarchy of Israel and by the despotisms of the surrounding eastern states. It is not, however, only the East or the past which offer illustrations of his

theme, or which are the field and period of the danger which he fears. Examples of the fulfilment of his prophecy can be found within Europe itself, and those within our own day. The Soviets of Russia are a case in point. But we need not look outside. There are in our midst institutions to which, though they have not yet reached the appointed term of their development, we shall rightly apply the Deuteronomist's warning. Certain of these institutions are political—Trade Unions and cognate organizations—but not all : and it is to one of the latter, little known to the great body of Englishmen, yet not undeserving of their watchful attention, that I invite your notice this afternoon—the National Assembly of the Church of England.

No apology for the invitation is necessary. The Church Assembly, as this body is popularly called, has recently sought public notice by means of a collection of essays written about itself by several of its more prominent members. That a quasi-public body should thus indulge in self-advertisement may at first excite surprise : but it is an open secret that the Assembly has not received from Churchmen that enthusiastic welcome which its promoters hoped and expected. The indifference with which it was greeted in its early days soon turned to dislike, when it was discovered that the setting-up of the Assembly's administrative machinery involved the payment by each parish of a money contribution, of which the amount was assessed by an external authority, and for which the Assembly's machinery and what it effected seemed no adequate return. Among the clergy, dislike was due in particular to the lack of consideration for themselves and their status which, in the name of efficiency and their own betterment, the Assembly displayed towards them. The disregard for clerical difficulties shown in the Pensions measure and by the Office which has administered it gave ground to the fear that the establishment of the Assembly was leading to the establishment of a Church bureaucracy, no less unpleasant in its behaviour than the State bureaucracy of war-time, though unable to claim the same sanction of necessity. In more recent days dislike has deepened into distrust. There is alarm that the body which some ten years ago was declared to be the means of enlarging liberty is being used instead as an instrument for its curtailment.

The foundation of the Assembly after the close of the war was almost as inevitable as the establishment of the monarchy in the days of Samuel. There was a widespread feeling, especially among the younger members of the community, that the methods and machinery of the Church were out of date, and that something should be done to remedy the defect. This had already been recognized by the Commission of Inquiry into the relations between Church and State. It was admitted that there was need of apparatus for facilitating the framing and passing of ecclesiastical legislation, for which, however necessary it might be, Parliament could make no time. The Assembly was designed to provide the apparatus. It was principally the result of the activities of a small but determined group. There were certain persons who wished the new body to fulfil in the life of the Church the function performed in the Army by General Headquarters. The Assembly was to co-ordinate operations, and, presumably, to institute a military discipline. By this time, however, public opinion no longer favoured military modes; democratic institutions had become the fashion. The new body must therefore be representative and parliamentary in character. It must represent and express the mind of the Church exactly as Parliament represents and expresses the mind of the Nation as a whole. Its measures must be measures *of* the Church, and not measures *for* the Church.

It follows then that to the mind of its promoters the especial value of the Assembly consists in its representative character. Its right to respectful attention is based upon the fact of it being the organ of the Church's self-expression. It is in a true sense, we are told, the Parliament of the Church, although still subject to the Parliament of the Nation. The comparison indeed is obvious, and is often made. The similarity of the two institutions, however, though commonly accepted, is not as close as might at first appear. Apart from the constitution of the Assembly in three houses, there are considerable differences in the matter of representation itself. The elected members of the Assembly are to be found in the two Houses of Clergy and Laity. In the House of Clergy, however, out of a total of 320 members, 112 —rather more than a third—sit *ex-officio*. A considerable proportion of these *ex-officio* members is formed of archdeacons,

who, as is well known, owe their appointments to, and are the colleagues of their diocesan bishops. There can be little wonder that the opinion is sometimes expressed that though these gentlemen take their seats in the House of Clergy they should be reckoned rather as representatives of the House of Bishops. The House of Laity alone, therefore, can claim to consist of elected representatives. But we shall be in error if we think that a member of the House of Laity is the ecclesiastical equivalent of a member of the House of Commons. In a Parliamentary constituency, electoral rights belong, or can belong, to the majority of the inhabitants. The elected candidate is the direct representative of the majority of his constituents. The ecclesiastical constituency is, of course, the diocese; but the diocesan representative is not elected by the majority of lay people whose names are on the parochial Rolls. He is elected by the lay members of the Diocesan Conference. These persons are themselves elected by others. The diocesan representative is, in short, a representative of representatives. He is the spokesman of no more than a small group of persons who have time and inclination for ecclesiastical business. The system of election to the House of Laity may in itself be defensible. Its results, let it be granted, are not wholly bad. Members of that House have proved their usefulness in the deliberations of the Assembly. But the electoral system is such as to invalidate the claim, all too often advanced on behalf of the House of Laity, that it represents the mind of the totality of the lay members of the Church of England.

There is yet one other representational difference between Parliament and the Church Assembly, and not least in importance, although last in order. The Universities send representatives to Parliament. The rightness of University representation has been recently called in question. The defence has been brilliantly made, and accepted, that Parliament is representative, not of the political power of the Nation, but of the Nation itself. The function of Parliament is therefore to be the microcosm of the Nation, and University representation is, in consequence, not only legitimate, but also desirable, if not essential. The Church Assembly should be no less a microcosm of the Church, one would suppose, than is Parliament of the Nation. Yet in

the Church Assembly there are no University members. This is the more surprising in view of the intimate connection between the Church and the two ancient Universities since the first establishment of the latter. The sound learning which once was the boast of the Church of England was — and in the main still is — the sound learning of the Universities. We who are here need not to be reminded that the Church retains a special position in the two senior Universities and the Colleges connected with them. Notwithstanding, the ecclesiastical authorities have in this matter ignored the Universities. It cannot be pleaded that this was an oversight or a mistake. Several years ago it was proposed that representation should be granted to the Universities. The responsible authorities considered the proposal, and consulted advisers. The advice was unfavourable. Private prejudice was exalted into a principle of public procedure, and University representation was definitely and deliberately refused.

In view of these and similar facts, the plea that the Church Assembly is representative of the Church cannot be sustained. It is not adequately representative of the laity. It is not adequately representative of the parochial clergy. It is alone fully, and more than fully, representative of ecclesiastical officialdom.

The bearing of these facts, however, can only be appreciated when they are considered in relation to the Assembly's legislative procedure and achievements. The chief function of the Assembly, it will be remembered, is to prepare legislative measures for presentation to Parliament. In conduct of business there is a marked difference between these two institutions. There is in the Assembly no possibility of a change of what corresponds to the Government in Parliament. The Government in the Assembly, the officials, that is, in control of business, is permanent. It can be affected by resignations, by superannuations, or by death, but never by defeat. It can be out-voted, but it cannot be voted out. There is, also, no equivalent of His Majesty's Opposition. This absence of official opposition, though it by no means precludes opposition, yet weakens its force. Opposition in the Assembly to official measures is necessarily diffusive and inco-ordinate as against the organized official support provided by *ex-officio* members and those associated

with them. It is not too harsh, perhaps, to say that opposition of a more than formal kind is apt to be regarded as proceeding from a wicked heart or a weak head. In consequence, official measures meet with less drastic treatment in the Assembly than do Government measures in Parliament. Opposition is at best half-hearted when it is known that the defeat of a measure will increase the difficulty of a situation without ultimately leading to its relief. When more opposition than usual is anticipated or has been shown, it is not unknown for the members in charge of a measure, or for the authorities interested in a resolution, to guillotine the opposition and to make appeals *ad misericordiam* for a favourable vote. An example of this is afforded by the proceedings on the occasion of the appointment of the Commission to inquire into the relations between Church and State, in February of last year. The subject was one of first importance to the Church. Full time for speaking was naturally and rightly allowed to the Vice-Chairman of the Assembly, who was the Proposer, and to the Seconder of the resolution to appoint the Commission. Before the debate had proceeded far the Chairman limited speakers to fifteen minutes. He concluded the debate with a lengthy summing-up, heavily in favour of the motion, reminding his hearers that he was 'harassed and pressed every moment by administrative duties and responsibilities,' and appealing to the laity for their assistance in setting up the Commission. Thus, in a few hours, after a restricted debate, the Assembly was led to take action which may have lasting consequences for the Church. It is an ineluctable conclusion that the Government of the Assembly had determined that the motion should be passed, and that it was omitting no steps to forestall an unfavourable vote. Such methods as these can win for the ecclesiastical authorities neither confidence nor respect. Not the least evil aspect of this procedure is that its results are presented to the world as the fully considered mind of a body alleged to be fully representative of the Church as a whole.

Suspicion of the Church Assembly, however, is not confined to the conduct of its business. There is a growing uneasiness among clergy and laity alike with regard to the character of its principal acts, the official measures presented to Parliament for approval. The official party makes full use of its advantageous

position. It issues no detailed programme of policy; it professes only to promote efficiency and necessary reform. Nevertheless, from an examination of its measures, it is clear that it is pursuing a course of self-entrenchment and self-consolidation. Evidence of this can be found in the 1929 form of the Patronage Measure. The right of private patronage was not to be abolished by this measure, but the patron's powers were virtually reduced from appointment to suggestion. On a benefice falling vacant, the patron makes his choice of an incumbent and informs the bishop. The bishop then informs the parish, to whom the right of objection belongs. If the parish exercises its right, the bishop may rule the objection out of order, or he may submit it to the Diocesan Patronage Board, with which the final decision is to rest. The Diocesan Patronage Board, it should be noted, is always to include three *ex-officio* members: the rural dean, the archdeacon and the bishop himself, as chairman. Thus the bishop becomes judge in his own cause. The measure has recently been modified. Appeal to the archbishop is now possible. The key position, however, still rests with the bishop as chairman of the Diocesan Patronage Board. Also, the worst feature of the 1929 measure remains: the patron's nominee, if any objection is made against him, is not allowed to know the objection or to face the objectors.

Another instance of official action is afforded by the Cathedrals measure soon to be submitted to Parliament. There is much disputable matter throughout the measure, but it will be sufficient to consider those proposals affecting priest-vicars and minor-canons. Corporations of priest-vicars and minor-canons are to be abolished, and their property, real and personal, is to be transferred compulsorily to the Cathedral chapters. Freeholds of priest-vicars and minor-canons are also to be abolished. The tenure of these clergy is to be at the good pleasure of the Dean and Chapter, and their duties shall be such as the Dean and Chapter shall decide. It has recently been said, with good reason, that 'Speaking generally, these clauses will reduce the position of all future junior cathedral clergy to something less independent than that of an assistant curate.' The official defence, that these clauses are based upon passages in the Report of the Cathedrals Commission, carries little weight when it be-

comes known that priest-vicars and minor-canons were not represented on the Sub-Commissions which visited the Cathedrals several years ago. Equally unconvincing is the plea that, though involving sacrifice, the proposals serve the good of the Church. How the Church could be benefited by them taking effect is not evident, and indeed is not explained. On the other hand, two facts are strikingly evident. The first is that the measure contains no proposals affecting the tenure of Deans and Canons. The second is that Deans and Canons benefit considerably by the provisions in question, both in acquiring the property of the suppressed corporations and also in replacing their former colleagues by servants in Holy Orders.

There is, it will be observed, a two-fold danger in legislative proposals of this description. Their trend is not only to increase the power of the ecclesiastical officials; it is also definitely to weaken the position of the inferior clergy, beneficed or unbeneficed, and to expose them to attack both from below and above.

The gravest feature of the Assembly's legislative work, however, is yet to be noticed. Its specifically reform measures have one characteristic in common : they assign to the diocesan bishop powers, of wide extent and often not far short of arbitrary, which he has not enjoyed hitherto. The risk of such a course is obvious; but as the course is not confined to one measure, it can only be interpreted as deliberate policy. The first of the measures illustrating this course is the Ecclesiastical Duties measure of 1926. This measure empowers the bishop to set up a Commission to investigate a charge of negligence of duty against any incumbent in his diocese. The offence was new in ecclesiastical law, and its scope was vague and is still undefined. In proportion to the uncertain nature of the offence, the power made over to the bishop is considerable : superficially it is a discretionary power, but it can be used also as a power of pressure, and as such is exposed to misuse. The necessary reform could have been effected in a manner less open to mistrust. Again, the Patronage measure, it will be recalled, gives to the bishop the key position in all disputes in his diocese concerning patronage other than Crown Patronage. The exercise of patronage affects the life of a diocese and its clergy most intimately. It is essential for the harmony of a diocese, and for the sense of

freedom upon which the effectiveness of the work of the clergy depends, that the administration of patronage should be as free as possible from the interference of persons having other interests to serve than the good of the parish in question. The diocesan bishop is clearly such; and both as referee of objections and as chairman of the Diocesan Patronage Board, he acquires over his diocese and the persons within it powers which may easily become oppressive in their exercise, and for which no adequate check is provided.

Had the proposed Prayer Book of 1927 been sanctioned by Parliament, the bishops would have secured for themselves wide powers also in matters relating to worship. The archbishops and bishops of the two provinces sought to give themselves power, in rubrics in the proposed Book, to frame, for the regulation of public worship, rules and canons which were to have the force of law without the necessity of Parliamentary sanction. The failure of the Prayer Book to pass into law does not affect the significance of these rubrics. They represent an attempt in this matter on the part of the bishops to set themselves above the law. This attempt should be considered in conjunction with the legislative proposals of the Assembly, and with a view of the episcopal office which has been gaining ground in the Church of England, particularly during the last ten years.

According to this view the episcopate is the seat and source of spiritual authority in the Church on earth. Spiritual authority is authority in matters pertaining to God, exercised in the name of God, and having a claim to obedience as unto God. To the uninstructed, it may be noticed, spiritual authority, according to this view of it, appears to be identical with ecclesiastical authority. It is maintained, therefore, that not only is the bishop the proper executive officer in all affairs ecclesiastical, but his executive acts and official utterances have a divine sanction which constitute a right to unquestioning loyalty and obedience, as unto God. The language used in this connection not infrequently ascribes to the bishops possession of the Spirit in the same way as infallibility is ascribed to the Pope by Roman Catholic theology. The bishops themselves in general appear to endorse this interpretation of their office and work. In the days of the Prayer Book controversy it was significant that their

appeals were less often made to sound learning than to the Holy Ghost. From the point of view of an administrator, the practical advantages of such an interpretation and of its wide acceptance are not inconsiderable. From the point of view of the ordinary churchman, be he a member of the laity or of the inferior clergy, the practical application of this interpretation is fraught with menace.

The Deuteronomist's prophecy is pertinent. If my argument has been plain, the prevailing distrust of the Church Assembly will be recognized as intelligible and justified. Beneath the cover of an apparently democratic institution, the ecclesiastical authorities are pursuing a policy the reverse of democratic. Under the aegis of Liberty, liberties are being suppressed. What was to have been the megaphone of the Church has become the microphone of its officials. What at the beginning was said to be only a change in the machinery of government is proving to be a change in the method of government. Whether or not the Assembly accepts the extreme interpretation of the bishop's function and office, the trend of its legislative effort is set in that direction, and its measures give effective expression to the theory. By means of its measures, the Church Assembly is transforming the Church of England into a federation of petty monarchies. The consequences of such changes may be disastrous. The present process can have but one conclusion. The day is not far off when the claims of the ecclesiastical authorities will be irreconcilable with the Royal Supremacy. Whether the ecclesiastical authorities will succeed in severing the Church's relations with the State must in the end depend upon the ordinary churchman's loyalty to the Church, to the whole Society, as distinguished from loyalty to its officials. But one event is certain. In the day in which the ecclesiastical officials finally establish the control which they seek, the Church of England as we have known it will cease to exist. Separated from the State, removed from the mainstream of the English tradition, it will no longer be the Church of England. It will be nothing more than a Church in England.

The final victory of ecclesiastical officialdom will involve the Church of England in irreparable failure to perform the work for which it exists.

IN DEFENCE OF SHAKESPEARE

A REPLY TO SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS

By Edgar I. Fripp, William Noble Fellow in English Literature in the University of Liverpool. Life Trustee of Shakespeare's Birthplace.

(*Concluding Article.*)

I COME now to the three biographical chapters, 'Shakespeare's Origin' (1—26), 'The Stage in 1592' (27—56) and 'Shakespeare and His Company' (57—91). At the close of the first Sir Edmund Chambers says: 'It is no use guessing. As in so many other historical investigations, after all the careful scrutiny of clues and all the patient balancing of possibilities, the last word for a self-respecting scholarship can only be that of nescience.

> 'Ah, what a dusty answer gets the soul,
> When hot for certainties in this our life!'

Something, however, depends on the 'soul' and the 'certainties' he is 'hot for.' History is made up of other material than 'certainties' and 'possibilities.' There are valuable assets called 'probabilities.' Science is largely dependent on faith.

Sir Edmund Chambers lacks faith in matters not after his heart, while he believes to the full in heresies of his own. Stratford is outside his creed. He damns it with faint praise. Driven by recent research from the dreary assumptions of Halliwell-Phillipps, that it was 'a dirty and ignorant town, an unmeet cradle for poetry,' he acknowledges 'some want of historical perspective' in that view. 'Some,' not much. 'The town was not out of touch with a larger civilization. . . Nor was it entirely bookless' (9). 'What has perhaps puzzled readers most' in the character of Shakespeare is his 'courtesy, his easy movement in the give and take of social intercourse among persons of good breeding. We have not, indeed, to think of the well-to-do inhabitants of Stratford as boors, but the courtesy of a provincial town was not quite the courtesy of a Portia' (24). The neighbourhood 'indeed' was not wanting in Belmonts. It would be difficult to find more stately dwellings than Kenilworth and

Warwick Castles (with their Court visitors and functions), Stoneleigh Abbey near Coventry and the White Friars within that city (the midland capital of England), Charlecote and Compton Wynyates, Coughton Court, Baddesley Clinton and Wroxall; or more beautiful, if lesser, homes of culture than Haseley, Guy's Cliff, Warwick Priory, Clopton, Clifford Chambers, Beauchamp Court and others within walking or easy riding distance of Henley Street.

But Chambers has a poor opinion of the Poet's father. He speaks of his 'drab life.' 'Drab' is not the adjective I would apply to the craftsmen and spirited burgers of his day. Stratford was full of skilful handworkers, freemen, after apprenticeship, of a score of 'mysteries.' John Shakespeare was a glover and a wool-stapler, and was engaged, as many craftsmen were, in agriculture. Such handicrafts, unlike mechanical industry, were educative. They provided something better than a mere book-culture. They begat common-sense, efficiency, and song: all lacking in Hamlet. Nor were these men (whose wives were as trained in their fingers, and therefore in their wits, as themselves) uninterested in municipal, national and ecclesiastical affairs. John Shakespeare (*c.* 1527-1601) lived in one of the greatest epochs of English history. He saw the Reformation, the introduction of the English Bible and Prayer-Book, the accession of Elizabeth and public apprehension of Mary of Scots; twelve remarkable years (through the balanced strength of the opposing parties) of religious latitude, followed by prosecution, active of the Catholics, more or less passive, with some bitter exceptions, of the Puritans; the breadth of Grindal and the narrowness of Whitgift, resistance to Whitgift by the Dudleys at Kenilworth and Warwick, and their protection of Cartwright; the defeat of the Armada, the triumph of the Queen and her policy; the break-up of the old Privy Council, new men and parties; adventure, drama, the rise of William Shakespeare to Courtly favour and popularity; and the shock to the nation of the folly and execution of the Earl of Essex. Nor was John Shakespeare a passive onlooker. He became an energetic and invaluable member of the Corporation, for three successive years (an unwonted period) was Chamberlain, responsible for the borough finances, when under his auspices popish 'images'

were 'defaced' in the Gild Chapel, and the adjoining premises of the old Catholic Gild were transformed into a borough hall and offices and a more commodious Latin School. He was Bailiff, with his Protestant friends, John Wheeler and Henry Higford, for colleagues as Head-alderman and Steward, in the anxious months before the outbreak of the Northern rebellion in November, 1569. As Head-alderman he was chief colleague of the Bailiff, Adrian Quyney, when the latter, at the first meeting after election (10 October, 1571), was instructed to sell the Romanist vestments formerly in use in the Gild Chapel. Suddenly he withdrew from the Corporation, and he never took office again. He also, at the eleventh hour, declined coat-armour. These decisions coincided with the advent of Whitgift into the diocese, early in 1577. Soon afterwards he disposed, mysteriously, of his wife's property at Wilmcote, and in 1580, the year of the projected marriage of Elizabeth with 'Monsieur,' he was fined heavily (probably for treasonable speech), £40, in the Queen's Bench. Twice in 1592 he was presented as a recusant—'for not coming monthly to the Church according to her Majesty's laws'—with eight others in Stratford, including his old and well-to-do friend, John Wheeler, and his son John Wheeler junior, for whom the excuse was offered that it was 'said' they were in 'fear of process for debt': obviously Protestants, as distinct from a longer list of inhabitants, including the Cloptons and other well-known Catholics, on whose behalf, by friendly neighbours, it was declared that they had all 'conformed' or 'promised' so to do. Four years later, on 17 July, 1596, the new bishop, Bilson, determined to have no more excuses, asked for the Commission Ecclesiastical to enable him to deal personally with the delinquents, of both kinds, the Catholics for their 'obstinacy,' the Protestants, men in 'Warwick and the parts thereabout, precisely conceited,' who 'trouble the people with their curiostity.' The Bishop sent in a list of 'gentlemen' and their wives. On this list we find John Wheeler and his wife, John Smyth (probably the vintner of Stratford), and Thomas Greene, no doubt Shakespeare's cousin, the lawyer, of Warwick and the Middle Temple, a 'Puritan knave.' John Shakespeare's name does not appear, and for the reason that he was not yet a 'gentleman.' A much longer list,

unfortunately only referred to, 'of four score and ten several households' 'of the meaner sort,' would include that of the Poet's father, who by the Poet's means and at his desire, no doubt, on 20 October following was granted again coat-armour and credited with 'lands and tenements and substance' of the value of £500.[1] In the last year of his life this well-to-do old 'gentleman' was called in, with other prosperous veterans,[2] to give evidence and advice against the rapacious claims of the lord of the manor, Sir Edward Greville. They quoted a letter from the late Lord Treasurer Burghley.

Here is a 'religious romance' not favoured by Sir Edmund Chambers. He prefers one of his own. He is prepared to accept as genuine an extraordinary document professing to be John Shakespeare's *testamentum animae*, written in the life-time of his 'parents,' the last of whom died in 1560-1, and said to have been found in 1757 in the roof[3] of one of his Henley Street houses.[4] 'Much of our information' respecting this document, he acknowledges, 'comes through' the fabricator Jordan, but he cannot believe him capable of the 'scholarly knowledge' or 'devotional language' displayed in it. It is easy to ask how that 'drab' John Shakespeare, alien to 'a religious romance' and unlikely to have been 'in fact a recusant,'[5] was equal to such learning and speech, not to mention the lengthy handwriting, some time, perhaps a considerable period, before 1560-1? It is

[1] A figure staggering to critics under the misapprehension of the Poet's mean upbringing and station in his native town.

[2] Master Adrian Quyney and Master Thomas Barber of the *Bear*.

[3] It is likely enough that this date is that of the renewal of the roof and removal of the gables, still preserved in the sketch of the 'Birthplace,' by Richard Greene, engraven for *The Gentlemen's Magazine* in 1769.

[4] Said by Jordan to have been discovered by a bricklayer on 29th April, 1757; and sent about 1789, after the bricklayer's death, to Malone by a Mr. Payton of Shottery, who had received it from Thomas Hart, of the house in Henley Street (who declared that he remembered the discovery), Jordan providing missing particulars (with discrepancies); but rejected by Malone, as by nearly every scholar since, until the present champion.

[5] I do not understand what Sir Edmund means by saying (i. 15*f*.) that a Puritan would not be 'in danger' in 1592. The Puritans had been in peril of presentation since 1577, but they were usually favoured by the churchwardens and commissioners. Whitgift complained to Burghley in 1584, after six years' experience of the Shakespeare country, that is was hard to get witness against Puritan preachers. 'If the chief gentleman in the parish, or most of the parish, be so affected, nothing will be presented, as experience teacheth.' This was truer of the laity than the clergy in 1592.

easy also to point out that, in spite of forged archaisms, the language and spelling of the *testamentum* are emphatically not those of a Stratford man of that period.[6]

Sir Edmund is sceptical about the Birthplace. 'So far,' he says, 'as the records go, it may as well have been 'in Greenhill Street as in Henley Street' (33). Surely not. Greenhill Street is a bare possibility, Henley Street an overwhelming probability. John Shakespeare bought a house in Greenhill Street in 1556, but there is no evidence that he ever lived in it. Nor is there further reference to it. On the other hand, he was in business in Henley Street in 1552,[7] bought a house there in 1556, and owned a block of three houses[8] there in 1590, including presumably the two houses which he purchased in 1575, one of them, we may believe, the subject of the lawsuit from 1582 to 1592. William Shakespeare inherited his father's property in Henley Street and bequeathed the tenancy of part of it to his sister, Joan Hart, for life. His granddaughter, Lady Barnard, in 1670 bequeathed the freehold of the whole of it to Joan's descendants; and here they lived until it acquired reputation as the Poet's 'Birthplace' and was sketched as such by Richard Greene of Lichfield (before 1757 ?), and engraved for *The Gentleman's Magazine* of July, 1769, prior to the Garrick 'Jubilee' at Stratford in September. Its gables had been removed when the 'Birthplace' was sketched (if his effort can be called a sketch) by Jordan in 1790; the front of the eastern house was rebuilt in brick in 1808, and the remaining middle and western houses, in a bad state of repair, were photographed more than once in the middle of the nineteenth century, with results which prove some inaccuracy of

[6] He would not write 'account,' 'pennance,' 'danger,' 'devill,' 'give,' 'demand,' 'virtue,' 'than,' 'together,' 'as soone as,' 'value,' 'certain,' 'Catholic,' 'mind,' 'write,' 'deliver,' 'encourage,' 'endure,' 'time,' 'trial,' 'should,' 'anoint,' 'like,' 'ordain'; but almost certainly, 'accompte,' 'penaunce,' 'daunger,' 'divell,' 'geve,' 'demaunde,' 'vertue,' 'then,' 'togither,' 'soe sone as,' 'valewe,' 'certeyne,' 'Catholique,' 'mynd,' 'wryte,' 'delyuer,' 'incourage,' 'indure,' 'tyme,' 'tryal,' 'sholde,' anoynte,' 'lyke,' 'ordeyne'; and his manuscript would be strewn with such forms as 'yf,' 'yt,' 'ys,' 'hee,' 'bee,' and the ending '-cōn' for '-tion.' And what are we to make of the word 'executresse'?

[7] So we conclude from his being fined, with his neighbour, Adrian Quyney, for keeping a refuse-heap there.

[8] *Duo tenementa,* that is, adjoining edifices on two sites, and in this case, as often, more than two messuages.

detail in the engraving of 1769,[9] and an incapacity for truth in Jordan's delineation, but warrant substantially the main lines of the restoration of 1860.[10] There is no break, therefore, in documentary record or tradition.[11]

Chambers accepts Rowe's statement (about one hundred and twenty years after the supposed event) that 'the narrowness of his circumstances' forced his father to 'withdraw' Shakespeare from school. Rowe heard (by confusion of the two Johns, the glover and corviser) that he had 'ten children,' and he may have heard of his numerous lawsuits, and concluded, as some modern biographers have done, that his means were small. But the excellent Latinity in Shakespeare's writings, in his earliest as in his latest, would indicate a prolongation rather than a curtailment of his time at school. It would point also to professional life rather than a manual craft subsequently. Hence, probably, the report which reached Aubrey through William Beeston about 1681, that Shakespeare 'in his younger years' was 'a schoolmaster in the country.' This 'is not in itself,' says Chambers, 'incredible' if his 'post' were 'no more than that of an usher or an *abecedarius*.' But the pedagogue is very little in evidence in Shakespeare's dramas and is satirised. The Poet sympathized with the boys. Moreover, even an *abecedarius*, I believe, had to be licensed, and Shakespeare's warrant does not appear in the episcopal registers. There is ten times more law than pedagogy in Shakespeare. If the culture of one profession is conspicuous above the rest it is that of an attorney's clerk. 'It is extensive,' says Chambers, 'rather than exact'; and he adds, 'it is shared by other dramatists.' Is this hearsay, or the result of independent strenuous research? It is the common,

[9] 'R.C.R.,' in a series of illustrated articles in *The Birmingham Post* of 27th, 28th and 29th August, 1930, drew attention to some 'fanciful details' (which are fewer than he thinks) in the engraving of 1769; and claimed Jordan's effort as the 'earliest extant view' of the Birthplace, overlooking the false drawing of the timberwork and the mistakes in the dimensions of windows in both the upper storey and the ground floor. How unreliable is Jordan may be seen in his reproduction of Mason's Court ('Gorshaw's') in his sketch of Rother Street (*Outlines*, ii. 24 and i. 158).

[10] No doubt, the restoration could be more learnedly and expensively done to-day.

[11] The question of the Birthroom is another matter. See *Shakespeare Studies*, 66-9.

orthodox opinion, and I think quite inadequate. For more than twenty years I have been at work among legal documents of Stratford and Warwickshire of Shakespeare's day, with an eye to his legal terminology, metaphor and situation, and I am satisfied that his country-town law is as exact as it is extensive, and that his use of it, from the outset, is as general, easy, spontaneout and (to the injury sometimes of his art) unconscious as that of contemporary dramatists is local, laboured and self-conscious. He does not pick it up as he makes his literary journey, but scatters it from his store, as he does his Ovid and his Bible, his youthful sport and love of Avon and Arden, and his good breeding. If there is anything in probabilities, he left the Latin School for an attorney's office, and on the completion of his articles married Anne Hathaway.

Sir Edmund is sceptical about Anne Hathaway — whose daughter she was, and where she lived, and what relationship of affection or estrangement existed between her young husband (seven or eight years her junior) and herself. There was more than one Richard Hathaway who might have been her father. 'The balance of evidence,' he concludes, 'seems to point' to the daughter of Richard Hathaway of Shottery rather than of Richard Hathaway of Loxley 'as Shakespeare's wife' (ii, 51). But there is no 'seems' nor 'balance' in the matter. Richard Hathaway of Loxley (a very interesting man genealogically, as we know from a series of recently discovered wills, connecting him with John Shakespeare's neighbours and friends in Stratford, the Hills and Tylers) made his will on 24 September and was buried (at Loxley) on 28 September, 1546, ten years before Shakespeare's wife was born.

Only 'kindly sentiment,' we are told, believes that Shakespeare and his wife, like other respectable couples, were betrothed before marriage (18). And what are we to make of this? 'Children can be baptized but not begotten without a father, and it is reasonable to suppose that Shakespeare was still in Stratford during 1584.' Anne's twins, Judith and Hamnet, were baptized on 2 February, 1585, and it is 'reasonable' to suppose that Shakespeare was at home in 1584 to beget them. This is a reflection on Anne; as it is hard on her husband that we may not assume his presence with the godparents, his friends Judith and

Hamnet Sadler, at the baptism. 'From 1584 to 1592,' says Sir Edmund, sternly self-respecting, 'there is an hiatus in Shakespeare's history, and not until 1596, if then, is there evidence of his presence again in Stratford.'

Let us look first at the 'hiatus, 1584-1592.' Sir Edmund accepts the 'deer-stealing' and 'flight' to London, but declares 'we have no certainty of Shakespeare's presence in London before 1592,' when the 'scoffing notices' by Greene 'shows he was already an actor and had begun to write plays.' And he adds: 'This is no doubt consistent with some earlier sojourn which may have been of no long duration.'[12] Again he says: '1591 is the earliest year to which there is ground for ascribing any dramatic work by Shakespeare that we know of, and even as a player his career may not have begun long before 1592—it is a mere fantasy that he was enlisted by Leicester's men on a visit to Stratford in 1587.'[13] But what are the probabilities? As we have already seen, Greene's 'scoffing notices' in the summer of 1592, and Chettle's apology in the autumn, imply a standing for Shakespeare in the theatre, in literature, and in society absolutely inconsistent with an arrival in town, even if free of every handicap of a novice in disgrace, in 1591 or even 1590. In devotion to 'nescience' we are not bound to accept miracles. A serviceable 'Shakescene' and *Johannes Factotum*, an 'excellent' player, the author in main part of a highly successful trilogy, a recognized master (among 'the best,' Greene, Marlowe, Peele, and other University poets) of blank verse, a writer of repute among the worshipful for his happy grace, with a character for good breeding and honesty, is not produced, even if he have 'genius,'[14] in a few months. He needs his apprenticeship under skilled hands, and examples in the fitting environment, and the five years since 1587, instead of being a 'fantasy,' are in the highest degree a likelihood. His enlistment by Leicester's Men would explain much which Chambers leaves unintelligible. In his *Elizabethan Stage*[15] Chambers found it difficult to decide whether 'Will, my Lord of Leicester's jesting player' (referred to by Sidney at Utrecht on 24 March, 1586)

[12] i. 22. A pure surmise. [13] 59.

[14] 'Genius' is not infrequently summoned to support a weak argument.

[15] ii. 90.

was Shakespeare or Kempe: 'William Shakespeare is, on the whole, less likely than the famous comic actor, William Kempe.' He still identifies him with Kempe dubiously—'almost certainly,' 'perhaps,' 'probably'; and he has a fancy that Kempe's fellows on the Continent, including Masters Bryan and Pope, were not Leicester's Men, but 'picked up' by the Earl 'on the Continent': as if the almost princely commander of the English expedition to the Low Countries would recommend any but his own tried and appreciated servants to the King of Denmark! Kempe, Bryan and Pope joined Strange's Men after the Earl of Leicester's death in 1588. Strange's Men played at the Cross Keys in London in 1589, when they got into trouble for participation in the 'Martin Marprelate' farces, and at the 'Curtain' (one of James Burbadge's houses in Shoreditch) in 1590. Then they gained the coveted distinction of performing at Court, twice, in the Christmas-Shrovetide season, 1590-1; and so well did they acquit themselves that *in the season following*, 1591-2, *they were called upon to play no less than six times, the Queen's Men, a crack company since* 1583, *playing but once*. How shall we account for this remarkable success? Alleyn perhaps had something to do with it—he was closely associated with Strange's Men in 1592; but what of *Aeteion*, what of the 'only Shake-scene,' 'excellent in the quality he professes,' author of the transformed 1, 2, 3 *Henry VI*, a rival of Marlowe in blank verse, regarded with jealous rage by Greene, commended as a poet and a man by the worshipful? 'Hot for certainties,' we may get 'a dusty answer'; but content with probabilities we shall be satisfied, in the absence of anything to the contrary, that Shakespeare was enlisted by Kempe in 1587, and with him, and Bryan and Pope, who also became his 'fellows,' he joined Strange's Men and was instrumental in their sudden and, as it transpired, permanent triumph over the Queen's Company.

Kempe is an acknowledged feature and connecting link in Shakespeare drama. His comic, and pathetic, little person drew laughter and tears, or supplied between the acts a jig. With him departed Shakespeare's Clown after Dogberry in *Much Ado*; how far back may we trace his shaggy head, his leg-and-staff nonsense, his solemn stupidities and simple solemnities—to Gobbo, Grumio, the Gardener in *Richard II*, Costard, Dromio

of Ephesus, and Launce? I think beyond these, to a number of parts in *Henry VI*: the Mayor of York, the father that has killed his son in iii; Jack Cade, Simcox and Horner in ii; Mortimer and the Mayor of London in i.

On 3 March, 1592, at the 'Rose' Strange's Men brought out *Harry the Sixth* as a 'new' play; and on 6 March, at this theatre, they performed *Four Plays in One*. The 'plot' of the latter is extant, from which we learn that extracts from 3 *Henry VI* were embodied in the piece: a curious combination of plays illustrating three of 'The Seven Deadly Sins' (Envy, Sloth and Lechery). The 'plot' gives a list of the performers save two, and includes old and new members of the company—Bryan and Pope, Augustine Phillipps, Richard Burbadge, Harry (no doubt Condell), Sly, Cowley and others, and boys. The two unnamed, who took the parts of King Henry and the moralizing Lydgate, were probably Shakespeare and Heminge. Kempe is not named—he probably gave impromptus in the intervals. If this was so, if Shakespeare in 1592 was an active member of Lord Strange's company, though not yet a 'sharer,' we can understand how in 1594 he had become a 'sharer' in the company when reorganized under the patronage of the Lord Chamberlain.[16]

But this idea of Shakespeare belonging from the beginning to one brotherhood of players, acting and writing for them, and gradually making his way among and with them, studying, using and developing their gifts and peculiarities, until he becomes their ruling spirit,[17] does not commend itself to Sir Edmund Chambers. He has his own theories, very complicated. He dates the 'plot' of the *Deadly Sins* 1590, and definitely excludes Shakespeare from it (though he includes the unnamed Kempe). His reason is the presence in it of Richard Burbadge. Because Alleyn broke with James Burbadge at the 'Theatre' in 1591, he assumes that Kempe must have broken with him at the same time at the 'Curtain,' and therefore could not have had his son, Richard Burbadge, in his company in 1592. He dates the petition of Strange's Men to the Privy Council to re-open on Bank-

[16] This valuable piece of constructive criticism, the most important yet in Shakespeare scholarship, we owe to Fleay, Greg and others, above all to John Tucker Murray (*English Dramatic Companies*, i. 77-85).

[17] T. W. Baldwin, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company*: a most illuminating book in its main argument.

side, 1591, not 1592; identifies *Harry the Sixth* of 2 March, 1592, at the 'Rose' (on the Bankside) 'new,' with 1 *Henry VI*, and ante-dates 2, 3 *Henry VI* to 1 *Henry VI*; believes that Alleyn was responsible for the success of Strange's Men in 1591-2, that Alleyn in 1592 formed an 'amalgamation' (not a mere 'alliance') with Strange's Men and 'managed' it, both in London and in the provinces, and that it was really (though he was careful to name himself always a Lord Admiral's man) Alleyn's Company. He thinks that Shakespeare did not belong to Strange's Men, nor to 'Alleyn's Company,' but may have joined the newly-formed Pembroke's Company, which in less than a twelvemonth, in August, 1593, in spite of his genius, went bankrupt; and that he may have bought a 'share' (as Richard Burbadge, so he conjectures, must also have done) in the Chamberlain's Company in 1594 (if Kempe and his brethren were willing to admit him outright, after his failure in the Pembroke's, to full equal membership); and that the young Earl of Southampton may have provided the wherewithal, 'some such amount as £100,' being the 'incredible' £1,000 mentioned by Davenant without a probable added cipher. All this to me is guesswork and gratuitous.

But to return to Stratford. Good wives with good husbands make little noise; with adulterous husbands they are apt to be 'heroines.' Anne Shakespeare in contemporary record is as silent as Cordelia—she grieves for her boy, receives the savings of her father's old shepherd in trust for the poor, teaches her children the Bible,[18] entertains a preacher at New Place, inherits from her husband the bed (and therefore the chamber) she had probably shared with him at New Place, and is honoured affectionately by her daughters on her tombstone. Stratford tradition was that she and her daughters 'did earnestly desire to be laid in the same grave with him'; and Jordan, for once, was not far from the truth in his report of 'poor Shakespeare,' on his departure to London, 'obliged to quit his father, his fond

[18] So I gather from the Biblical phrase in honour of her daughter on the latter's gravestone, 'Wise to Salvation was good Mistress Hall.' The allusion is to II Timothy iii, 15: 'And that thou hast known the Holy Scriptures of a child, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through the faith which is in Christ Jesus' (Genevan). Men and women knew their Bibles in those days and quoted them aptly.

wife, his prattling babes, and his native-place.' In 1587 the eldest child was four, the twins two years old. But the Mistress Shakespeare of gossip and 'conscientious' biography is the long-suffering wife of a libertine of genius, 'not known' to have been the 'companion' of his 'absence' (lasting any time from five to twelve years), and the mother of 'no more children' (at any rate that lived). Yet 'about 1596' he 'may have begun to pick up the broken threads of family-life.' Why 1596? That year is strangely inconsistent with Sir Edmund's dates for the *Sonnets* and their alleged confessions of intercourse with the Black Beauty, namely, '1593-6' and '1595-1599 or 1600.' But why 1596? 'The boy Hamnet was buried in Stratford on 11 August, 1596.' On the death of his son, then, did Shakespeare put away his 'mistress' and spend a short time at home? 'We do not know that he ever let go altogether of Stratford.' Why speak, then, of 'absence,' of 'broken threads,' and of the possibility ('may') of his 'beginning' to 'pick them up'? In fact, we do know that he did not let go of Stratford. He joined his father and mother in their suit against Lambert in 1587. He was in Warwickshire, if he travelled with Leicester's Men, in 1588, and, if he travelled with Strange's Men, in 1592 and 1593. He was at home to write a posy for 'a pair of gloves' sent by the Stratford schoolmaster, Aspinall, on the latter's betrothal, to his lady, Widow Shawe (mother of Julyne Shawe) of Henley Street in 1594.[19] He was probably the 'Mr. Shaxpere' (though it may have been his father) who bought 'one boke' of the belongings of Richard Field's sister in Stratford about August, 1595.[20] Moreover, has any poet written, incidentally, of children, small boys and girls, including *twins*, of their games and ways and moods, so fully and feelingly as Shakespeare has done in his poems and plays of 1590-1595?[21] What are the probabilities? Would a man fond of his children prefer a harlot to his wife? Would he keep himself a stranger from them for five years together or more, when compelled by his business to be six or even nine months away? Why not accept Aubrey's statements,

[19] 'The Gift is small, the Will is all, Alexander Aspinall.' Fane Commonplace Book, f. 177, in the Birthplace Library. See *Shakespeare's Stratford*, p. 50.

[20] Miscellaneous Documents vi, 246 (Birthplace).

[21] *Master Richard Quyney*, 95-100.

'Mr. William Shakespeare was wont to go into Warwickshire once a year,' and 'he was wont to go to his native country once a year'? At any rate, is there merely 'a reflection' of the death of his son Hamnet, only 'a possible echo' of Anne's grief, in the pathetic lines of *King John*, a work of 1595:

> Grief fills the room up of my absent child,
> Lies in his bed, walks up and down with me;
> Puts on his pretty looks, repeats his words,
> Remembers me of all his gracious parts,
> *Stuffs out his vacant garments with his form?*

Anyone, I think, brought up in an artist's studio will recognize personal feeling and portraiture at such a moment behind the picture inadequately called 'Constance,' a mother whose son, if imprisoned, was not dead. But the great Painter, we are to believe, having buried his boy in the Stratford Churchyard, kissed his daughters (aged 13 and 11) and his wife (on the forehead) and returned to London to enjoy his 'misplaced and thwarted affections.'[22]

He must, indeed, have been the creature of 'moods which were not all compatible with concentration on what he was writing,' and for a considerable period under the shadow 'of some preoccupation or disillusionment' wherein 'the life and subtlety of his style suffered and he was often careless and perfunctory.'[23] We should not have thought it; but given the feeble voluptuary here depicted, the wonder is that he wrote anything good at all.

Yet Shakespeare wrote in these years (1595-1600) magnificently[24]—produced work as free from evil preoccupation and ethical fallacy as can be conceived, in variety and breadth of mood indeed but with matchless concentration, heedless it may be of trifles but awake and breathless as to the things that matter, and not least the fundamental matter of sex.

Nor do we believe that Shakespeare was merely 'interested in the technique of his profession' and 'perhaps found its practice irksome.'[25] That he did not 'star,' is evidence in him of the

[22] i, 73.
[23] 228.
[24] *The Merchant of Venice, King John, Romeo and Juliet, I and II Henry IV, Henry V, Julius Caesar, Much Ado about Nothing, As you like It.* There's not much of the Harlot behind these dramas, but an abundance of the love and sanity of Home.
[25] i, 84.

Artist. He took 'kingly parts,' for which nature and 'good breeding' peculiarly fitted him, and parts he would not trust to an inadequate performer, such as the Ghost in *Hamlet* and old Adam in *As You Like It*: minor rôles in quantity, but in quality indispensable.[26] His enthusiasm for the stage appears less in the technical instructions of Hamlet or Quince, or the melodramatic quick-changes of Richard III, than in the superb stagecraft of the dramas, their opening, the introduction of the hero and heroine, the growing, intriguing hold upon us of the story, and the 'embattling' (to use Ben Jonson's fine word) of the contrasted features of folly and wisdom, the mud and the flower or star; and in the unconscious use of the language and imagery of the stage, which drop from him as spontaneously, and sometimes as queerly, as those of Scripture, Ovid, and Country Town Law. That Shakespeare's name early disappeared from the actor-lists cannot surprise us. Beaumont and Fletcher, and even Jonson, whatever his generous desire to give them a start, after the first must have bored him unspeakably. There was really little or nothing in common between them.

More than once we have seen Sir Edmund Chambers throw off his lofty robe of Nescience. His most startling emergence therefrom is in the following outburst:

> 'Shakespeare's spirit must have been nearly submerged in *Lear*, and although the wave passed and he rose to his height of poetic expression in *Antony and Cleopatra*, I think that he went under in the unfinished *Timon of Athens*. The chronology of the plays becomes difficult at this point, and it is therefore frankly a conjecture that an attempt at *Timon of Athens* early in 1608 was followed by a serious illness, which may have been a nervous breakdown, and on the other hand may have been merely the plague. Later in the year Shakespeare came to his part of *Pericles* with a new outlook. In any case, the transition from the tragedies to the romances is not an evolution but a revolution. There has been some mental process, such as the psychology of religion would call a conversion. Obviously the philosophy of the tragedies is not a Christian philosophy, and in a sense that of the romances is.'[27]

Here indeed is 'guessing.' Is it of 'no use'? Frankly, it must be confessed, not much. If, as is probable, *Pericles* (entered at Stationers Hall on 20 May, 1608) preceded *Timon of Athens*, the whole argument tumbles to pieces. For the first and last

[26] 'The very minor part of Adam,' says Chambers. See *Shakespeare Studies*, 151—168.

[27] i, 86.

time there is allusion to Religion. Sir Edmund never, I think, in his thousand and odd pages mentions the Bible, though more than any book (in the Geneva and Bishops' versions) it fed and sustained the Poet's genius. And among the hundreds of works consulted and named by him, I do not find Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* nor the *Parker Society* publications, without which I cannot understand a scholar coming to grips with Elizabethan theology. Whatever the Poet's leanings in his earlier years in London to Hooker's prelatism, or in his last years to the current puritanism, his theology is that of his age. He has been nourished on the doctrine of 'Rude Will' and 'Grace'—of fallen human-nature and the redeeming Spirit, of man's 'carnal bondage' and the Divine favour, of sensuality and salvation by repentance, of earthly wilfulness and waywardness and the Over-ruling Providence. This 'Christian Philosophy,' common to puritans and prelatists but denied by free-willers and villains like Iago and Edmund,[28] I find throughout Shakespeare's writings, from *Lucrece* to *Romeo and Juliet*, and thence to *All's Well* and the tragedies, and again thence, through the romances, to *Henry VIII*; and if his faith is more meditative and devotional in his last plays, I see no evidence of a 'conversion.' *The Tempest* is not one whit more Christian than *Othello*—a marvellous study of a simple convert, face to face with (the worst kind of 'paganism') a conventional unbelieving belief, and its victim; and so far from *Macbeth* and *Lear* being un-Christian, they seem to me, whatever their 'pagan' setting or language ('Gods' for 'God,' and so forth), at the summit level of Christian Experience. The development of conscience in Lady Macbeth, and the corresponding deterioration and hardening of her husband, do not call for conversion in the Artist. The spiritual attainment of poor, wilful, foolish old Lear (not to mention the change in Gloucester in his purgatory) is worthy of Dante:

> 'Upon such sacrifices, my Cordelia,
> The gods themselves throw incense.'

But Shakespeare, we are to believe, was 'converted' in 1608, and not before it was time. A boy had been christened in Oxford in 1606 of whom it was to be said ('whether there was any

[28] See *Othello*, i, 3, 319-340, and *King Lear*, i, 2, 128-144. Such denial of Grace and assertion of the human Will would have horrified the audience.

ground for it or not') that he was more than the Poet's godson; and elsewhere 'a natural daughter,' 'the poor girl,' was 'no great improbability.' In qualified language, which is the more damning, Sir Edmund gives his verdict against 'poor' Shakespeare (more worthy of our sympathy than his unknown and 'improbable daughter') with reiteration of the feeble and stale evidences:

> 'We cannot, I think, ascribe to him that rigid propriety of sexual conduct, the absence of which in more modern poets it has too often been the duty of their family biographers to conceal. The indications of the *Sonnets* and perhaps *Willobie his Avisa,* John Manningham's contemporary talk of a more ephemeral intrigue, the gossip about Mistress Davenant, do not leave an impression of complete fidelity to Anne Hathaway.'

'Complete,' 'perhaps,' 'rigid,' 'think,' 'cannot,' do not take the sting out of the *innuendo*, here I believe made for the first time, that the Poet's 'family-biographer' had something it was his duty to conceal. Nor is the verdict in the least bit modified by the further remark:

> 'But as to the normal sobriety of his life, we may be content to accept the report that he was not a company-keeper and that he wouldn't be debauched, and if invited to, writ he was in pain.' [29]

Such normality and abnormality of conduct as fidelity and adultery are not to be harmonized like iambic pentameters and Saxon stress-verse. Impropriety and even insobriety is a polite and lying term for 'fornication,' which 'Heaven stops the nose at.' Between it and 'honesty' of life a gulf is fixed. We have to choose between irreconcilable judgments—that of the Poet's own friends and fellows in the discipline and high attainment of Art Life; or that of critics removed by Time from the scene and the Man, and sheltered (in this case by the distance of more than three centuries) from all need of apology or fear of the reproach and reprisal of the Great Dead.

[29] i, 90 *f.*

BOOK REVIEWS

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH*

This is a statement of the Anglican standpoint, written for the (more rather than less) educated layman. Canon Malden's approach is historical—what the English Church has been and has done; and his immediate aim

* *This Church and Realm.* By R. H. Malden. pp. xvi+232. (Oxford University Press, 1931. Price 7/6.)

is to bring before the layman the issues involved in the Reunion problem. His own position appears to be that of Bishop Headlam, and like the bishop he says what he thinks even when he is probably wrong. Not many judicious readers of Hansard, for example, would agree that 'the debates on the Prayer Book measure in the House of Commons would have been laughable had the issues involved been less serious' (p. 2). Nor does there seem much justification for the opinion that 'the Modernist is not deeply interested in history '(p. 211). Many parish priests of experience would question the statement that in most places only about half of the fairly regular worshippers are communicants (p. 133), and it is by no means academic minds that view with alarm the charity that is prepared to baptize infants indiscriminately (p. 142). In this last case the language is so obscure that it is hardly possible to know what view of Baptism and its Administration is presented. But then Canon Malden is at his best not on questions of faith but on questions of order. His interests and his wisdom are those of the statesman rather than the philosopher. He often says shrewd things. Witness the following: 'Wesley . . . never . . . appreciated the value of unremitting and unadvertised parochial work' (p. 39). 'In refusing to authorize the new Prayer Book the House of Commons did interpret the mind of the nation correctly' (p. 44). '(Probably) their (*i.e.* Anglo-Catholics') success owes at least as much to their personal characteristics as to the catholic system which they are administering' (p. 46). 'Ecclesiastical history warns us that popular devotion is always liable to outrun theology, and that whenever this happens the result is to lower men's conception of God' (p. 146). 'Any Anglican who . . . maintains that episcopacy is always necessarily essential everywhere to the existence of a true branch of the Church of Christ is going beyond the teaching of his own Church' (p. 166).

'If it (*i.e.* Modernism) can hardly be said to have leavened the whole Church, it has not fallen far short of doing so' (p. 210). The whole chapter on the 'Historic Episcopate' is a valuable summary, the more so as giving a lucid statement of the Jurisdiction-Theory of the Episcopate held by St. Thomas Aquinas. E. J. MARTIN.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE HEBREWS.*

Many teachers, compelled by their position to add 'Scripture' to their own special subjects, will be grateful for this little book written by the Divinity Mistress of King Edward's High School for Girls, Birmingham. Pressed for time, they will here find what the Foreword promises, 'a bird's-eye view of the sweep of Hebrew history and of the development of the Jewish religion from the time of Moses to the culminating point in the Birth of Christ.' And all this without what many a teacher, bewildered by the niceties of scholarship in larger works, has petulantly called 'beating about the bush.'

No other small school-book treats so lucidly the collecting and editing of the Scriptures, matters seldom used during the lesson-hour, yet how necessary if the teachers' view-point is to be at once balanced, accurate, and intelligible.

If in a subsequent edition an index were added, the usefulness of the book would be increased.

The illustrations, mostly from photographs, are good; the *format* is attractive and the price astonishingly low. H.E.S.

* B. K. Rattey. (Oxford University Press, 1931. Price 2/9.)

CORRESPONDENCE

A BARTHIAN DEFENCE.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

In his article, 'The Light that Failed,' Mr. Hardwick has put the case against the 'dark god' of the 'Ottoesque and Barthian fantasies' with that power of analysis and sparkling quality of style and humour which make most readers of the *Modern Churchman* delight in all that he writes. There is no doubt that the candle-light of reason burns a deal more brightly when he is tending its flame. So much so that we are almost persuaded to forget that it is only one of the lamps of the sanctuary. We have grown so accustomed to worshipping inside our human temple that when the floodlights are turned on we are in danger of mistaking them for the sunshine outside. At the risk of being numbered among the sansculottes in whom the light of reason has failed, it is worth while trying to answer some of the criticisms in Mr. Hardwick's article.

First, Mr. Hardwick rests his criticism of the non-rational in Otto and Barth on the assumption that the non-rational is necessarily the *anti*-rational. Thus he implies that if the object of religion is 'dark and inscrutable,' therefore it is *sinister*: if 'the intellect must take a back seat,' therefore there must be substituted for it some kind of *animal* instinct or intuition: if the divine righteousness is not human righteousness, therefore it is *inhuman.* The assumption throughout is that what is not human is, *ipso facto, less* than human. If we find it impossible to worship a God who is not beyond all that human reason and idealism can aspire to, therefore we are worshipping a *'bogey-man.'* Surely this assumption begs the question at issue.

Second, Mr. Hardwick writes: 'The *mysterium tremendum* only gives one the *creeps,* and makes one feel that the power or powers behind Nature are not such as one can worship very comfortably.' I have written 'creeps' in italics, so that we may be warned against the brilliancy with which Mr. Hardwick here makes his candle shine. For at this point he uses for the purposes of his own argument that very bogey-man whom elsewhere he bids us put gently but firmly aside. The truth which has been recaptured by Otto and Barth (which need not be tied down to the particular form and language in which they have expressed it) is the biblical one that 'the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.' We should not be put off from understanding this by being persuaded that this fear has anything in common with that fear of ghosts or evil spirits or other phenomena, real or imaginary, which are able to give us 'the creeps.' With this correction in mind, we may agree with Mr. Hardwick that the Barthian outlook does not contribute a great deal to our 'edification or delectation or consolation,' and that those who fear God in this biblical sense cannot worship Him 'very comfortably.' The very strength of the Barthian thought, it seems to me, is that it makes clear the fact that God does not exist for our edification, delectation or consolation, and that a God whom we could worship comfortably simply would not be God.

The truth seems to be that in whatever part of our temple we choose to place our Holy of Holies, we are sure to discover sooner or later, if we have the courage to penetrate its portals, that it is empty. This emptiness seems to be the one important discovery of the present age. Having made it, there are two courses open to us. We may decide to stay inside, and,

like Mr. Aldous Huxley, watch the artificial lights playing on the mosaics; or we may acknowledge the emptiness and the darkness inside and seek the sunshine outside. In the latter case, we are not likely to be either consoled or made comfortable. Both the late Mr. D. H. Lawrence and Dr. Karl Barth are in their different ways trying to point out the glories of the sunshine to those whose eyes have become all too accustomed to the dim religious, rational and intellectual light of our human temple.

Third, it is not true that the Barthian thought regards the light of reason as having gone out. It says that reason is not enough, which is quite a different thing. By reason it means all the human faculties. It does not wish to substitute some other human faculty, real or imaginary. It regards all the human faculties as playing a necessary part in that search of man for God which must for ever be pursued, but which can never be fulfilled. When, like those in the parable, the human faculties have done all that is commanded them, they must confess that they are unprofitable servants, having only done that which it was their duty to do. It is easy to pour scorn on the religion of the 'trembling savage,' as we contrast it with the rational and spiritual heights reached by ourselves who are the enlightened children of a great civilisation (bother the War!); but it is doubtful whether his religion or ours will be much the better for it, or the cause of truth forwarded, until we realise that the living God who claims our worship is as different from the rational and spiritual being enthroned in Western Europe as He is from the dark mystery that overawes the savage.

ROY MCKAY.

7 Berkeley Mansions, Bexhill-on-Sea.
May 22nd, 1931.

REPLY OF REV. J. C. HARDWICK.

The points raised by Mr. McKay are of interest. He may be right in suggesting that the non-rational is not necessarily equivalent to the anti-rational, but I do not see what guarantee we have that it may not in practice turn out to be so. The point about reason is that most human beings possess their normal share of this faculty, whereas intuitional gifts vary considerably with individuals. If I am presented with an argument, I can test it rationally, and so either refute or accept it; but if I am presented with an intuition I cannot test it.

I certainly hold to my contention that if the object of religion is dark and inscrutable, the odds are that it will be sinister. Mr. McKay knows as well as I, and if he does not know, Miss Malim's article in the same issue of the *Modern Churchman* will inform him, what kind of cultus goes with a dark and inscrutable god.

With regard to the fear of the Lord which is 'the beginning of wisdom,' it seems clear that the 'fear' spoken of by the pious Jew is a sublimation of a cruder fear instinct, just as romantic love is a sublimation of a cruder sex instinct. But the worship of a dark inscrutable god could never effect the sublimation in either case.

I was not pleading for a 'comfortable' religion in the sense of an arm-chair religion. When I said that a 'dark' god could not be worshipped comfortably, I meant that you could not worship with an easy mind a god who might be waiting to play you some trick.

My prejudice in favour of reason is that it is a human faculty—the insects can beat us in instinct as the animals can beat us in sense perception. And this prejudice in favour of reason is bound up in my mind with belief in a rational God, who, *because* He is rational, is therefore, so far, human.

(Or if you like to say that man in virtue of his possession of reason is, so far, divine—sharing God's nature, it is only saying the same thing the other way round.) Rationalism and the 'white,' Christian, Johannine, Platonic God go together. If you give up the one you give up the other—sooner or later. In ten years the more intelligent Barthians will be Roman Catholics, and the less intelligent will have been caught in the maelstrom of Fundamentalist delirium.

This talk of God's 'otherness' has an attractive sound. People give you credit for depth if you claim to believe in a God of mystery. And I think, incidentally, that the 'mystery' business is being overdone by the scientists who are busy writing best-sellers. A mysterious universe and the 'otherness' of God are a couple of post-war intellectual fashions which will pass. Mr. Cross, in his able book on religion and science, reviewed recently in the *Modern Churchman,* reminded us that some of our popular scientific preachers need not be taken too seriously.

All this 'otherness' is ultimately fatal to religion, since if God is 'other,' He is unknowable, and communion with Him becomes impossible. Let me urge Mr. McKay not to be led astray by the characteristic Teutonic romanticism of Barth. The English genius is more akin to the French, and believes in reason. And in England the Christian tradition is Platonist. Why sell our birthright for a mess of pottage?

J.C.H.

A BERGSONIAN DEFENCE.

Sir,

May a Bergsonian put in a word in defence of his convictions? I cannot answer for the other elements of the 'rabble,' as Mr. Hardwick courteously terms us, but I cannot allow such a travesty of Bergson's position to pass without protest. Certainly he 'told his delighted . . . readers that intuition could reveal all mysteries to us if it only knew how.' There is nothing very fantastic in that to the evolutionist. Already we acclaim in poets and prophets this very power of throwing light on the dark places of life. I will go further and suggest that the evolution of faith in the consciousness of mankind is an effort to develop latent creative intuitional faculties that cannot be reduced to a formula, that can only be dimly visualised in thought, and must be followed up to take shape in experience of life. But when Mr. Hardwick goes on to put into Bergson's mouth the statement that 'mysteries which intellect was powerless to tackle would be transparent to *instinct,*' it is difficult to take him seriously as a student of Bergson.

Mr. Hardwick writes: 'One would suppose . . . that the light of reason had failed,' but who can deny that there are fields of vital import that the light of intellect alone leaves dark as night? It is true that Bergson aims at putting intellect into its place, but it is an honourable place that none but the arrogant should despise. Bergson's main plea is that intellect and intuition should work hand in hand, that intellect should follow up the clues that intuition alone is able to discover, as the hunt follows a trail that only the hounds can scent out. 'Intuition and intellect do not oppose each other,' he said in his 'Huxley Lecture' at Birmingham in 1911, 'save where intuition refuses to become more precise by coming into contact with facts scientifically studied, and where intellect, instead of confining itself to science proper (that is, to what can be inferred from facts or proved by reasoning), combines with this an unconscious and inconsistent metaphysic which in vain lays claim to scientific pretensions.'[1]

[1] See report of this lecture in the *Hibbert Journal,* Oct. 1911.

Bergson did not suggest that vertebrate evolution was a 'mistake,' but that we should be wrong to look upon it as the full and unhindered triumph of Life.

> 'Proud Man is not the perfect and supreme
> Realisation of a cherished dream.
> On other paths of life the 'might-have-been'
> Abandoned on his journey may be seen,
> In tendencies that Life has highly prized
> That came to standstill but half realised,
> Or in encumbrances, that, left behind,
> Have aided her to rise, in Man, to Mind.'

He suggests that it may be in our power to pick up some of these lost threads, to recapture some of the latent possibilities in the *élan vital.*

Mr. Hardwick wishes to 'make a clean sweep of this biological thinking in terms of unconscious purpose.' But he is too late. It has taken more than half a century for the true significance of the evolutionary process to infiltrate into modern consciousness, but it has now come to stay. Already the course of recent developments in physical science seems to march in line with Bergson's thought. The discovery of the prevalence of the 'accidental' in the molecular realm provides that slight element of elasticity in matter that Bergson postulated as a necessary condition for the dawn of life. Again, Einstein proclaims an expanding material universe, Bergson a growing spiritual universe. Henceforth we must discard the auxiliary verb 'to be';

> 'Philosophy, that now in vain pursues
> A phantom Reality through avenues
> That lead no whither, plods the dreary round
> That 'is' and 'is not' traces to confound
> The intellect,'

must now think in terms of becoming.

It is difficult to understand the hostility of theologians to the Bergsonian thesis. Christianity, apart from the element of cultus, has nothing to fear from an interpretation of the evolutionary process which is resolved 'to see the life of the body just where it really is, on the road that leads to the life of the spirit,'[2] and which points the way to a religion of self-realisation that has strong affinities with Christian Platonism.

TRANT B. LUARD.

Addington Green, W. Malling, Kent.
May 22nd, 1931.

REPLY OF REV. J. C. HARDWICK.

On p. 174 of *Creative Evolution* occurs the following:

'The intellect is characterised by a natural inability to comprehend life. Instinct, on the contrary, is moulded on the very form of life. While intelligence treats everything mechanically, instinct proceeds, so to speak, organically. *If the consciousness that slumbers in it should awake,* if it were wound up into knowledge instead of being wound off into action, *if we could ask and it could reply, it would give up to us the most intimate secrets of life.*' (Italics mine.)

[2] *Creative Evolution.* English translation. (Macmillan.) pp. 283-4.

Again, on p. 186:

'Instinct is sympathy. If this sympathy could extend its object and reflect upon itself, it would give us the key to vital operations—just as intelligence, developed and disciplined, guides us into matter. For—we cannot too often repeat it—intelligence and instinct are turned in opposite directions, the former towards inert matter, the latter towards life. Intelligence . . . goes all round life, taking from outside the greatest possible number of views of it, drawing it into itself instead of entering into it. But it is to the very inwardness of life that *intuition* leads us; by intuition I mean instinct that has become disinterested, self-conscious, capable of reflecting on its object and of enlarging it indefinitely.'

If he will read through these passages, I think Colonel Luard will admit that I did not misrepresent Bergson when I attributed to him the view that 'mysteries which the intellect was powerless to tackle would be transparent to instinct.'

I am unrepentant in my desire to 'make a clean sweep of this biological thinking in terms of unconscious purpose,' and on the ground that it is *loose* thinking. What meaning am I to attach to this conception of 'unconscious purpose'? A purpose is either conscious, or it is not a purpose. 'Unconscious purpose' is a hybrid, bastard notion. Those who hold it hover between the materialistic view which denies the existence of purpose, and the idealistic view which interprets existence in terms of conscious purpose. Like Mahomet's coffin, our biological thinkers are suspended between heaven and earth. They would like to soar but dare not; they would like to descend, but likewise they dare not. Biological categories seem to me to obscure the issue between theism and atheism by introducing a ridiculous *tertium quid*. They do not say there is a purpose, nor yet that there is no purpose, but that there is something very like one. Our biological philosophers offer to make the best of both worlds (I do not say *biologists*, as all the younger generation of scientific workers will have nothing to say to neo-vitalist mysticism, *vide* Professor Lancelot Hogben's recent work, 'The Nature of Living Matter'). But you cannot serve the God of scientific truth and the Mammon of edification.

I certainly think that our ideas of truth and its attainment, especially in art and religion, require clearing up; but one topic at a time is quite enough when one is writing an article. The Bergsonians and the Pragmatists seem to me to have led us astray, and the results in the religious sphere have been Otto and Barth and the neo-pagans with their mysteries and dark gods and 'otherness,' and so on.

I am not altogether without a theory of knowledge in the twin spheres of art and religion, but I have not gone to the biologists for it. It would be indecent, however, to try to explain it at the tail end of a footnote.

J.C.H.

AN OTTONIAN DEFENCE.

SIR,

I should be sorry to think that the article 'The Light that Failed,' in your April-May number, is representative of the mind and temper of the Modernist movement in the Church to-day. Along with serious misrepresentations of the views criticised there is a petulant superciliousness about it which would be amusing if it were not so disquieting as a symptom. For many of his confident assertions the author has, so far as I can see, no scintilla of justification. It is, for instance, grotesque to imply that the

admission of the irrational factors in human nature by modern psychologists means that 'they wish us to abandon our status as rational beings, and once again to become trembling savages.' Whatever we may think, for example, of the soundness or unsoundness of the Freudian analysis, it is surely patent that Freud is in many respects an old-fashioned rationalist with a naïve belief that man, in becoming more rational, will learn to discard the illusion that is religion.

And as regards the views of Otto, I fear that Mr. Hardwick must have made his rather cheap caricature at second or third hand. For Otto not only never says that 'the numinous feeling *is* religion,' but, on the contrary, he stresses throughout his book *Das Heilige* the inevitable interdependence of the numinous with the rational-moral elements in the true apprehension of the divine. Mere 'awe' may be first upon the scene, but even so, the fear of the devil-haunted savage is a degraded aberration from the primal 'religious' awe, let alone the essential truth of it; and, as apprehension becomes more enlightened, the awe becomes more and more of the nature of reverence.

Finally, as regards his references to Karl Barth, it must suffice to say that, one-sided as the Barthian contention may be, it is certainly not to be dismissed in such a patronising and cavalier fashion as that which Mr. Hardwick adopts.

He concludes by promising to 'make a clean sweep' of most modern thinking 'in terms of "unconscious purpose," "instinct" and so on.' It is a gallant attitude. But man, unluckily, though he will not be made a whit more rational than he is by such histrionics, may well be made more self-complacent and conceited by them, and it may plausibly be urged that in human self-complacency lies the root of all irreligion.

JOHN W. HARVEY.

Armstrong College, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
June 4th, 1931.

MR. HARDWICK'S REPLY.

I regret that the tone of my article should have struck Mr. Harvey as unduly supercilious. I was not writing *de haut en bas*. I certainly hold that, whatever Freud's view as to the future of religion may be, as expressed in his *The Future of an Illusion*, the New Psychology has tended to present man (only too truly, perhaps) as a non-rational animal. But this seems to me just why one ought to insist as strongly as possible upon a *rational* religion for him. Just because the natural man is irrational and immoral, he needs to have a rational and a moral religion, with as few concessions as possible to the lower side of his nature. A religion, which does not elevate, invariably degrades. Then with regard to Otto. I made it clear that I regarded his views as somewhat naïve, *i.e.* that in his hands the doctrine of the 'numinous' was a more or less edifying conception. He had presented the smile of *Erycina ridens* as being benevolent. But it seems to me, nevertheless, that the Otto doctrine *is* a reversion to pre-Christian ways of approaching the divine. I prefer the incompatible Johannine doctrine: 'There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment: he that feareth is not made perfect in love.' St. Paul has the same thing to say in *Romans* viii, 15.

As my reply to Colonel Luard expresses the reason for my suspicion of modern 'biological' ways of thinking, I may perhaps refer Mr. Harvey to it.

J.C.H.

SIR,

MARRIAGE LAW REFORM.

A strong desire was expressed at the August Conference of the Modern Churchmen's Union at Oxford that the Union should take action to bring before Parliament the necessity for a reform of our laws concerning marriage. The existing laws are supported by the highly-organised Catholic sect in the Church of England, and it was hoped that the Union would supply the necessary corrective. I understand, however, that the hope has been frustrated by the refusal of its Council to take any action. Yet it might seem that if any group within the Church might have been looked to to give a lead, it would be our Union. A growing number of the clergy and some of the bishops would be glad to support any movement to make effective the Recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1912, which the House of Lords has twice approved.

In view, however, of the failure of the Council of the Union to do anything, I can only appeal to those of the clergy who want a move on, and are willing to co-operate with that end in view, to communicate with me.

Your obedient servant,

W. F. GEIKIE-COBB, D.D.
(*Chairman of the Marriage Law Reform League*).

Church of St. Ethelburga the Virgin,
Within Bishopsgate, London, E.C.2.
May 29th, 1931.

SIR,

PROPITIATORY SACRIFICE AND DIVINE LOVE.

In connection with the interesting article on 'Sacraments in Human History,' I should like to refer to the misleading effect of the translation in the Authorised Version of certain passages in the New Testament.

In *St. Luke* xviii the prayer of the publican, 'Be merciful!' and Our Lord's comment, quite rightly, leave on the mind of the reader an impression that the story is a revelation of the kindness of God and His willingness to forgive, but this is not the conception conveyed by the term propitiation used in the first Epistle of St. John, and there is nothing to indicate that the substantive propitiation is the cognate word to 'be merciful.' In *Rom.* iii, 25, a careful reader will notice that the sentence Jesus is 'set forth to be a propitiation' is rendered in the margin 'to be propitiatory'; apparently '*to be*' is not in the Greek, therefore the sentence should *literally* be translated 'Jesus is set forth propitiatory.' In *Hebrews* ix, 5, the 'mercy seat' (in the temple) is rendered in the margin as 'the propitiatory.' So the reader discovers by close attention that the terms propitiation and propitiatory might equally well be translated by the term mercy or merciful. Why is there nothing to indicate this in *I St. John* ii, 2? His rendering is moreover the one preferred by Pluto, who, as we know, was a contemporary of the writers of the New Testament. He called the mercy-seat 'the Propitiatory,' and said that it represented the propitious power of God, which he defined as 'that whereby the Divine Artist compassionates His own worth.' How different is this from the common interpretation of the word propitiation. Surely we are justified in assuming that the disciples of Jesus thought of Him as the Mercy-seat, the representation of the Divine Compassion. Pagan conceptions have coloured Christian doctrine, and the terms need to be carefully explained to ordinary congregations.

HELEN ALICE DALLAS.

Innisfail, Crawley.
May 29th, 1931.